The
Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME V JULY-OCTOBER, 1919 NUMBERS 2-3

A GREAT FRANCISCAN IN CALIFORNIA: FERMÍN FRANCISCO DE LASUÉN

Undying fame is not wholly the result of merit. Rarely have the strange pranks of history been better illustrated than in the extraordinary reputation enjoyed by Junípero Serra, first Father-President of the Franciscan missions of Alta (or present-day American) California, and the almost complete oblivion into which has passed the name of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén, a worthy rival of his illustrious predecessor in solid achievement. Both men were able, and deserving of the recognition of posterity, but Serra had two advantages which gained for him the lasting glory which it now seems impossible Lasuén will ever have. Serra was the *first* Father-President, and shares, therefore, in the glamour of the conquest. Of far greater import, however, he was so fortunate as to have a devoted friend, his fellow-Majorcan, old schoolmate, and fellow-missionary of many years, Francisco Palóu, who wrote and published a life of the great Junípero, shortly after the latter's death. Theodore Roosevelt once said: "We could better afford to lose every Greek inscription that has ever been found than the chapter in which Thucydides tells of the Athenian failure before Syracuse."[2] In a similar vein the historian Bury wrote: "The early portion of Greek history, which corresponds to the seventh and sixth centuries B. C., is inevitably distorted and placed in a false perspective through the strange limitations of our knowledge. For at that time . . . the cities of the western coast of Asia Minor formed the most important

[1] The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance and criticism rendered in the preparation of this article by the Misses Florenze V. Taylor and Doris W. Bepler.

[2] *History as Literature* (Address of the President of the American Historical Association, delivered at Boston, Dec. 27, 1912), in the *American Historical Review* for April, 1913, Vol. xviii, No. 3, pp. 473–489 at p. 478.

and enlightened part of the Hellenic world, and of those cities in the days of their greatness we have only some disconnected glimpses. . . . The wrong, unfortunately, cannot be righted by a recognition of it. Athens and Sparta and their fellows abide in possession. *Les absents ont toujours tort.*"[3] So, too, Serra will remain famous (justly so) because of Palóu, while Lasuén cannot hope for the renown to which he is entitled, even though some later-day historian may yet piece together documentary evidence enough for a biography of this great Franciscan. Something should be done, however, to rescue Lasuén from undeserved obscurity, and it is hoped that this article may serve in a measure toward that end.

For lack of a Palóu we know little of the early life of Lasuén. He was a native of Vitoria in the Basque province of Álava,[4] a worthy representative of the race to which the upbuilding of the Spanish colonies was so greatly due.[5] The year of his birth is unknown, but it was probably about 1720.[6] Eventually, he was admitted to the Franciscan Order, and turns up in Mexico as a member of the famous missionary college of San Fernando.[7] He saw service as a missionary in the Sierra Gorda, in the region between the present-day states of Tamaulipas and Querétaro, but left there in 1767 to join the Fernandinos[8] under Father Serra, who had been charged to take over the missions of the Cal-

[3] BURY, JOHN BAGNELL, *A History of Greece* (London, 1900), p. vii.

[4] BANCROFT, HUBERT HOWE, *History of California* (San Francisco, 1886), Vol. ii, p. 9, n. 12.

[5] Cf. CHANDLER, CHARLES LYON, *Inter-American Acquaintances* (Sewanee, Tenn., 2 ed., 1917), pp. 170-178, on the Basques in Spanish America.

[6] This is the opinion of Hittell (HITTELL, THEODORE H., *History of California* [San Francisco, 1885], Vol. i, p. 454), which agrees with Vancouver's estimate, made in 1792, that Lasuén was "about 72 years of age." (VANCOUVER, GEORGE, *A Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean and Round the World* [London, 2 ed., 1801], Vol. iii, p. 56.)

[7] This institution was a college in the present-day sense only in that it served as a training-school for missionaries. It was also the administrative center for missionary work done by the friars of the college and a home to which they retired when relieved from their labors in the field. It was an off-shoot of the College (*Colegio de propaganda fide*) of Querétaro, which had been established in 1683. (BANCROFT, HUBERT HOWE, *History of Mexico* [San Francisco, 1887], Vol. iii, pp. 714-715). The *Colegio de propaganda fide* of San Fernando was founded in 1734. (ENGELHARDT, ZEPHYRIN, *The Missions and Missionaries of California* [San Francisco, 1908], Vol. i, pp. 614-617 [Appendix F, *Apostolic Colleges*] at p. 615).

[8] Franciscans of the College of San Fernando.

ifornias in succession to the Jesuits.[9] It was not until April, 1768, that Serra and his band reached Loreto across the Gulf, where Father Junípero at once proceeded to assign posts to the missionaries who had accompanied him.[10]

The Spanish settlements in the Californias at this time were confined to the peninsula of Baja California, mostly to the lower half, with Loreto, the military and religious capital, about in the center of the occupied part. There were fifteen missions at the time of the transfer from the Jesuits to the Fernandinos, but this number was soon reduced to thirteen. In anticipation of the occupation of Alta California, which took place in 1769, another mission, San Fernando de Velicatá, was founded in the extreme northern reaches of the peninsula. By far the most important of the missions and, with the exception of the presently to be founded Velicatá, the most northerly among them was that of San Francisco de Borja. It is a tribute to Father Lasuén that he was directed to take charge of this mission. The task which confronted him was very difficult. On the departure of the Jesuits, military commissaries had been placed in charge of the missions, and they had spent more time searching for the supposed hidden wealth of the Jesuits than in promoting the welfare of the missions. As a result the missions had fallen away, and they were still further impoverished by being drawn upon for supplies for the expeditions of 1769 to Alta California. Naturally, the distant post of Borja was among the last to receive aid for its rehabilitation. The condition of affairs there and the good sense of Father Lasuén are both illustrated by certain correspondence between him and the powerful royal representative, José de Gálvez, at that time temporarily in the peninsula, the letters bearing date between September, 1768, and February, 1769.

Gálvez had published an edict against gambling, and directed Lasuén to see that it was observed at the mission. Gálvez also suggested the advisability of giving tobacco to the Indians

[9] PALOU, FRANCISCO, *Noticias de la Nueva California* (San Francisco, 1874), Vol. i, p. 7. The Jesuits had just been ordered expelled from all Spanish dominions, by decree of the king of Spain.

[10] BANCROFT, HUBERT HOWE, *North Mexican States and Texas* (San Francisco, 1886), Vol. i, p. 484.

to gain their good will. Lasuén replied that he would comply with Gálvez's directions, but as a matter of fact the vice of gambling did not exist at Borja, and the Indians used tobacco only as snuff, and for that but sparingly. The real need at Borja was not reform or tobacco, but food and clothing, for "my children are most numerous, and hungry, and naked." In the five months (from May to October, 1768) that he had been in charge of the mission he had not received a grain of aid from anywhere. The letter impressed Gálvez, but in a most extraordinary way. He wrote to Lasuén that he proposed to relieve his necessities by deporting many of his neophytes to the better supplied missions of the south. It is somewhat strange that the experienced Father Serra should have endorsed this plan, which failed to take into account the extreme conservatism of the Indian in clinging to his native surroundings, however mean they may be. Gálvez went on to say that two boats were to be despatched north at once to get the Indian families designated by Lasuén for the southern missions. Lasuén was wholly opposed to this arrangement, but his answer to Gálvez's letter was a model for tact. Instead of making a stormy protest, he pointed out that the plan, though "very just and necessary," was "at this time exposed to many difficulties and more or less impossible of execution." The Indians of his mission were "still untamed and new in Christianity," wherefore it would be "very difficult to make them comprehend the great utility which would come to them from the change and the favorable advantages which you offer them." When one of the boats arrived to take away some of the Indians, Lasuén informed the captain that he would await further orders from Gálvez before embarking them. The correspondence closes with a letter from Gálvez recognizing the correctness of Father Lasuén's stand, and approving his suspension of the sending of the Indians from Borja.[11]

No connected account can yet be given of Lasuén's five year term as the missionary of San Francisco de Borja, although some more or less fragmentary records are at hand. Lasuén's problem, as indeed was that of the other Baja California missionaries, was not so much to build up his mission as to keep it from

[11] ENGELHARDT, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 314-319.

going to pieces. This he did, in the face of discouraging circumstances. It is said that there were 1,500 neophytes within the jurisdiction of the Borja mission at the time the Jesuits were dispossessed, some five hundred more than any other had.[12] From a report by Father Lasuén, dated August 31, 1770, it appears that there were 172 Indians at the mission, in addition to the sick who came in from the neighboring Indian villages. The greater number of the Christian Indians, however, lived in six Indian towns, or *visitas*, periodically visited by Father Lasuén for religious purposes. Two years before, in a detailed and exact report to Gálvez, who had issued a decree, dated July 12, 1768, asking information about the missions, Lasuén had stated that in his opinion there were 1,616 or 1,618[13] Indians under him. Since that time he had baptized 226 persons and 324 had died. By subtracting the excess of deaths over baptisms one should arrive at the number now in his charge—that is, 1,518 or 1,520.[14] A year later, in August, 1771, Lasuén reported that 401 persons had thus far been baptized during his stay at the mission, and so far as was known there was not a single pagan left in the whole district. There were then 1,479 persons under his rule, of whom 184 were at the mission, where it was not possible to take more because of the scarcity of water and cultivable land. The mission was moderately well stocked with domestic animals. There were about 500 head of cattle, 215 horses, 43 mules, 3 asses, 1,700 sheep, and 930 goats. Father Lasuén had planted vineyards, fig and pomegranate trees, and some cotton. The cotton was used at the mission in the manufacture of shawls for the Indians, and blankets were made of wool.[15] In May, 1773, when the Dominicans succeeded to the Franciscan missions of the peninsula, statistics showed that there were at Borja 1,000 persons, 648 cattle, 387 horses and mules, 2,343 sheep, and 1,003 goats. The importance of the mission stands forth the more clearly when it appears that there were but 4,268 persons and 14,716

[12] CLAVIGERO, FRANCISCO JAVIER, *Storia della California* (Venice, 1789), Vol. ii, p. 185.

[13] ENGELHARDT (*op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 386) wrongly states the number as "one thousand and sixteen souls."

[14] Lasuén to Palóu, August 31, 1770, in Bancroft Library, *Archivo de la Mision de Santa Bárbara*, Vol. i, pp. 29–33.

[15] PALOU, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 175–178.

domestic animals in all fourteen missions of Baja California. Thus, San Francisco de Borja, though by no means a favored spot, had under its control nearly a fourth of all the Indians in the missions and more than a fourth of the domestic animals.[16]

A still more eloquent commentary on the services of Father Lasuén at San Francisco de Borja might be made if it were possible to go into the intimate details of his private life. During five years he had been the sole missionary at that mission. Commenting on Lasuén's expressed wish for a second missionary there, Bancroft says: "We can in some degree imagine the desolate loneliness of a padre's life at a frontier mission; but the reality must have been far worse than anything our fancy can picture. These friars were mostly educated, in many cases learned, men; not used to nor needing the bustle of city life, but wanting, as they did their daily food, intelligent companionship. They were not alone in the strictest sense of the word, for there were enough people around them. But what were these people? —ignorant, lazy, dirty, sulky, treacherous, half-tamed savages, with whom no decent man could have anything in common. Even the almost hopeless task of saving their miserable souls must have required a martyr for its performance."[17] But there were material discomforts as well. Writing from Alta California in April, 1774, nearly a year after his departure from the peninsula, Lasuén begged to be relieved from the great hardship he was undergoing for lack of wearing apparel, which had already reached the point of indecency. His clothes, he said, had been in continuous use for more than five years. He had mended them until they no longer admitted of it, and, moreover, he no longer had materials for sewing. Referring somewhat humorously in another letter to his need for clothing, Lasuén said that it was perhaps on that account that the Indians cared for him so much, on the principle that like attracts like, for he resembled them much in scantiness of wardrobe.[18]

[16] CHAPMAN, CHARLES E., *The Founding of Spanish California* (New York, 1916), pp. 308-309. After Lasuén's departure the Borja mission declined at an alarming rate. In 1800 the total number of Indians under its direction was 400, and there were but 31 head of cattle, 130 horses and mules, and 1,000 sheep and goats. (BANCROFT, *N. M. St. and Tex.*, Vol. i, p. 762. n. 55).

[17] *N. M. St. and Tex.*, Vol. i, p. 729, n. 5.

[18] CHAPMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

When the Baja California missions were turned over to the Dominicans, eight of the Fernandinos, presumably the most capable among them, were directed to proceed to Alta California[19] where a number of presidios and missions had been established, the latter under the presidency of Father Serra, since the Spanish occupation of 1769. Lasuén was one of the friars ordered to the northern province. The missionaries left the peninsula in charge of Father Palóu, who for several years had served as president of the Baja California missions, escorted by a military force under Sergeant José de Ortega. The party reached San Francisco de Borja on June 22, 1773, and left there next day, thus bringing Lasuén's long ministry at that mission to an end.[20] En route north they made the first attempt that ever was made to run the boundary between the two Californias. The line of division had been agreed upon in Mexico in May, 1772.[21] In accord with that decision Palóu and his party raised a cross, on August 19, 1773, to mark the boundary between the Dominicans and Fernandinos. The line was some five leagues north of the *arroyo* of San Juan Bautista and fifteen south of San Diego, a number of miles below the present boundary. Eleven days later the party reached San Diego in Alta California.[22]

It is not surprising that Lasuén was assigned to the mission at San Gabriel. This had been founded in 1771, and gave promise of being the best site of all the missions from the standpoint of pastoral and agricultural possibilities. Hopes had not yet been realized, however, due in a measure to trouble with the Indians, caused by the improper conduct of Spanish soldiers.[23] Lasuén was the right man to bring prosperity to San Gabriel. He set out for his mission at once, and took up his duties there in September, 1773. The time was the least propitious possible, for the great eight months' famine which all but caused the abandonment of Alta California was already at its height. Sup-

[19] HITTELL, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 364.

[20] *Ibid;* also ENGELHARDT, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 487.

[21] CHAPMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 118. In 1775 this was accepted by the Council of the Indies as the official line. (*Ibid*, n. 59.)

[22] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, p. 195.

[23] CHAPMAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 101, 107, 123–125.

plies from New Spain reached San Diego on March 13, 1774, but it was not until some time later that San Gabriel was relieved.[24] Meanwhile, the first overland expedition to reach Alta California[25] arrived at San Gabriel on March 22, 1774, under the command of Captain Juan Bautista de Anza, having made an arduous journey from Sonora by way of the Colorado Desert.[26] This made matters worse for a while, since Anza, too, lacked supplies, but it meant an increased importance for San Gabriel, which henceforth was the first settlement in the province reached by those taking the overland route from Sonora.

Father Lasuén, already past middle life, had wished to retire to the College of San Fernando instead of coming to Alta California, but, on being informed that he could not be spared, resigned himself to remaining in the province.[27] He was destined never to leave, serving continuously in Alta California for thirty years. Little more need be said of his stay at San Gabriel. By the close of 1774 it was already the most prosperous of the missions.[28] Furthermore, the troubles with Indians had been overcome. A more serious task was now at hand. The march between San Diego and San Gabriel had always been difficult, owing to the treacherous character of the Indians.[29] Fathers Lasuén and Gregorio Amurrio were designated, in August, 1775, to found a mission between these two, to be called San Juan Capistrano. Lasuén, who was in Monterey at the time, made the long journey to San Diego,[30] and then turned back with Ortega, now a lieutenant, to make explorations for a site. In October, Lasuén formally inaugurated the mission. Father Amurrio soon arrived, and prospects seemed excellent, for the natives were well disposed, but after only a few days there came news of a great Indian uprising at San Diego. Ortega was therefore obliged to leave for San Diego, and advised the two

[24] *Ibid*, pp. 252-253.

[25] The journeys from Baja California cannot be so styled. The peninsula was merely part of a route, the first portions of which included the voyage across the Gulf of California.

[26] CHAPMAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 276–280.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

[28] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, p. 239.

[29] CHAPMAN, *op. cit.*, 329.

[30] About 500 miles.

friars to give up the mission. This seemed the part of good sense; so the mission bells were buried, and the place was abandoned.[31] Not long afterward, however, it was reoccupied.

The San Diego revolt of 1775 was the most serious attempt the Indians of Alta California ever made to drive the Spaniards out of the province. Suffice to say here that the revolt was a failure, despite the wide ramifications of the league against the Spaniards.[32] Because of the underlying seriousness of the situation, however, and especially because the Indians of San Diego had always been disposed to be troublesome, the presence at the mission of the most able friars in the province was imperative, to supplement the work of the soldiers of the presidial establishment near by. Father Lasuén was, therefore, called upon to remain at San Diego.

For a year after Lasuén's arrival at San Diego there were troubles in connection with the late revolt—troubles between the friars and Governor Rivera, rather than with the Indians. The former wished to follow a policy of conciliation, as opposed to the more stringent, long-continued measures of repression undertaken by the governor. These incidents may be passed over here with the remark that the friars were eventually sustained by the viceroy of New Spain. Father Lasuén remained at San Diego during the rest of Serra's presidency (ending with Serra's death, on August 28, 1784) and during the brief term of his successor, Father Palóu. Meanwhile, affairs at San Diego had progressed smoothly; the earlier hostile attitude of the Indians did not again manifest itself.

Palóu's succession to the presidency of the missions was understood to be temporary, for he had already asked permission to retire to the College of San Fernando. Permission was granted, and probably in September, 1785, Palóu departed for Mexico, where in the following year he became Father Superior of the college. The appointment of Lasuén as president of the missions was dated February 6, 1785, but it was not received in Alta California until September, when his long period of service at San Diego came officially to an end.[33]

[31] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, pp. 248-249.

[32] CHAPMAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 352–355.

[33] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, pp. 416-417; ENGELHARDT, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 404-405.

A detailed account of the achievements of Lasuén as Father-President of the missions would involve giving a history of the province during the eighteen years of his term. For the purposes of this article it seems better to select some phases of his work and character for treatment. First, however, it is necessary to give some idea of the power of a Father-President, showing the relation of that office to the general authority exercised in the province by the Spanish state.

Few writers on California history have been acquainted with even the bare rudiments of Spanish colonial administration. Most of them fail altogether to understand the relationship of the religious and the military establishments. Thus, many have referred to Father Serra as the conqueror and ruler of Alta California, and yet more have discussed the "conflicts between church and state" in the province. The clue to an accurate estimate of affairs is an understanding of the *Real Patronato* (royal patronage) of the Spanish kings. Briefly put, the kings of Spain exercised extraordinary authority over the temporal management of the Church in Spanish America as a result of various grants by the popes. Churchmen, from archbishops and other high functionaries down to priests or friars, were the appointees of the king or his sub-delegates. It was the king or his representatives who erected churches and convents, paid the salaries of churchmen, gave orders affecting the field of their labors, and in fine managed the affairs of the religious establishment in everything save in matters pertaining to the spiritual character of the profession. Thus, when the Franciscans entered Alta California, they went there because ordered to do so by Gálvez and the viceroy, even though the Father Superior of the College of San Fernando was opposed to the undertaking.[34] Occasionally, the mission presidents in Spanish colonies were granted exceptional authority. That was true of the Jesuit leaders in Baja California prior to their expulsion in 1767; there the Jesuit rectors were indeed responsible, under the viceroy of New Spain, for all that was done, for they headed the military and political establishment as well as the religious. This wide power was never exercised by Alta California Father-Presidents, though

[34] CHAPMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

doubtless many of them desired to approximate it as nearly as possible. They had religious authority only, while the military and political power resided in the governor.[35]

The Father-Presidents and the governors were to a certain extent independent of each other, but both were subject to the viceroy of New Spain, or to the commandant-general of the Provincias Internas[36] during part of the time after 1776. Save for the higher authority of the political rulers of New Spain and the Father-Superior of San Fernando (who was himself a subordinate, in a measure, of the viceroy), the Father-President held absolute power over the missionaries of his flock. They in turn exercised an almost absolute control over their individual missions. In theory they were mere administrators on behalf of the Indians until such time as the latter should become Christian and civilized. In fact, and necessarily (owing to the utter incompetence of the Indians), they directed the affairs of the missions, as would a father of a family, aided by Indian *alcaldes* who were elected by the Indians, but were virtually the appointees of the missionaries. The corporals at the missions had jurisdiction, under the governor, over the four or five soldiers of the mission guard and criminal jurisdiction over the Indians. This, almost the only authority outstanding from the friars, was a fruitful source of quarrels with the governors, who often insisted on the independence of the mission guard, while the missionaries held that it should be subordinate to their wishes. The Father-President was not empowered to take action on his own responsibility, but could only administer the missions as they were, and in accord with orders. He could, however, make recommendations for action directly to the viceroy himself. Thus, the founding of missions was not a matter for the Father-President or the college to decide, but must be authorized by the high officials of state in New Spain.

[35] Down to 1777, when Felipe de Neve took up his residence in Monterey, the governors of the Californias had resided in Loreto, Baja California. Theoretically under them, but actually more or less independent, were the lieutenant-governors in Alta California. After 1777 the lieutenant-governor resided in Baja California. The two provinces continued to be regarded as one until 1804, when their political separation was ordered.

[36] The northern, or frontier, provinces of New Spain, which became a separate jurisdiction from the vice royalty in 1776.

In fine, therefore, a dual power was established in Alta California. When the two elements clashed, as it was inevitable they should, the governor usually had the advantage, for he commanded the troops of the province and as a military man might expect to get a more sympathetic hearing from the viceroy or commandant-general, who were usually soldiers, too. But the friars, as a result of their intellectual attainments and the unselfishness of their pretensions, were often able to attain their objects. Furthermore, they were the only element in the province with economic resources at their command, for the missions produced almost all that was raised in Alta California during the Spanish period. The Father-Presidents were not the sole rulers of Alta California, but they are entitled to be considered with the governors as one of the two ruling elements in the province.

One of the principal objects of the Fernandinos, and of Fathers Serra and Lasuén in particular, was the founding of new missions, whereby more souls might be saved and Alta California placed on a sounder material basis. Of the twenty-one Fernandino missions, nine each were founded during the presidencies of Serra and Lasuén. Serra had long wished to establish a number of missions in the populous region bordering the Santa Barbara Channel, and authority for so doing was early received from New Spain. It was not until 1782, however, that the first of the missions, that of San Buenaventura, was founded, the last of Serra's nine. One of the earliest acts of Lasuén's regime was to add two more. The Father-President himself, now in his sixty-sixth year, went to the presidio of Santa Barbara,[37] and superintended the founding of a mission near by. On December 4, 1786, this mission, Santa Barbara, at the present day the most famous of all the twenty-one, was formally dedicated.[38] A year later, on December 8, 1787, Lasuén in person inaugurated the mission of Purísima Concepción at a point previously selected by Governor Fages, thus completing the Channel missions, although actual work at the new establishment did not begin until 1788.[39] Next, steps were taken to found two missions

[37] Founded in 1782.

[38] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, p. 423.

[39] *Ibid*, Vol. i, pp. 424-425.

between San Carlos of Monterey and Santa Clara, but clear authorization therefor was not received until July, 1791. Lasuén acted with customary promptness. Both sites had already been explored, but Lasuén decided to see them himself. He found that of Santa Cruz all that had been claimed for it, and dedicated the mission there on August 28, 1791.[40] The sites chosen for the other mission, Soledad, were not approved by Lasuén, who himself selected the spot for the founding. On October ninth, Lasuén was on hand to raise the cross at Soledad.[41]

The governors and the friars had long wished for additional missions somewhat farther inland, though west of the Coast Range, with the idea of reducing all the Indians of the coast districts between San Diego and San Francisco. Besides giving more converts to the faith this would remove the last vestige of Indian peril in the region under Spanish control. Governor Borica was particularly active in cooperating with Father Lasuén to achieve this end. The year 1795 was largely taken up with careful explorations for mission sites, and in the following year the viceroy authorized the founding of the five missions asked for. By May, 1797, everything was ready. Then followed the most remarkable era of mission-founding in the history of the province. Serra in 1771, and Lasuén in 1791, had established two missions in a single year. Now, Lasuén from June to September established no fewer than four, followed in June, 1798, by the erection of a fifth. At the inauguration of all these missions Father Lasuén presided in person, dedicating San José[42] on June 11, 1797, San Juan Bautista on June 24, San Miguel on July 25, San Fernando Rey on September 8, and San Luis Rey on June 13 of the following year. In so doing Father Lasuén had to traverse the whole occupied sphere of the province, some five hundred miles or more in length, enduring hardships which can hardly be appreciated in this day and age of luxurious travel. Verily, for a man in his seventy-seventh or seventy-eighth year Father Lasuén might have been pardoned

---

[40] *Ibid*, Vol. i, pp. 491–493.

[41] *Ibid*, Vol. i, pp. 492, 498-499.

[42] A number of miles north of the *pueblo* which gave the name to the present-day city of San Jose.

for feeling a high degree of self-satisfaction over his achievement, though there is no evidence to the effect that he did.[43]

Yet, Father Lasuén rendered perhaps even more distinguished service as an administrator than as a founder of missions. Not only must the new missions be placed upon a durable footing, but the old ones had also to be maintained. A right to administer the sacrament of confirmation had been granted to Serra for ten years. This ceased with his death, in 1784, at which time he had confirmed 5,309 persons. Lasuén was the only other Father-President to receive this right. It was granted for ten years in 1785, but was not forwarded to Lasuén until 1790. In the five-year period remaining to him he confirmed about 9,000 persons.[44] He also exercised other powers which ordinarily would have been in the hands of the secular clergy. Since there were no other priests in Alta California the missionaries had administered the sacraments and performed other religious services for the Spanish population, though this was not a part of their regular duties. In 1796 the Bishop of Sonora, unasked, conferred on Lasuén the titles of *Vicario Foráneo* and *Vicario Castrense*, whereby he was authorized to administer the customary sacraments other than that of confirmation to the civilian and military elements respectively. At the same time he was made *Juez Eclesiástico*, or ecclesiastical judge, for such cases as might ordinarily be tried in a church court. All of these powers he was allowed to delegate to his subordinates, which Lasuén accordingly proceeded to do.[45] In 1795, too, Lasuén had been appointed commissary of the Inquisition of Mexico. As such he had occasion to publish a few edicts forwarded to him from Mexico, and once "confiscated and forwarded to the capital four copies of a forbidden game called El Eusébio."[46] These new duties added considerable to Lasuén's responsibilities, for by his own account the Spanish settlers were careless about observance of certain precepts of the Church, such as those of

[43] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, pp. 550–564.

[44] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 328.

[45] ENGELHARDT, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 541-542. BANCROFT (*Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, pp. 578-579) states that these powers were "renewed" in 1796 by a new bishop, implying that they had been granted before.

[46] ENGELHARDT, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 542-543.

annual confession and receiving communion at Easter.[47] Yet, the old Father-President was far from being overwhelmed by his labors. In 1797, after he had just completed the founding of the four missions established in that year, Governor Borica, who regarded the achievement as extraordinary, complimented him, and observed that he must have renewed his youthful vigor by bathing in the holy waters of another Jordan.[48]

There is another side to Father Lasuén's administration deserving of comment in this connection. Whenever there was anything important to be done, he went himself to attend to it. His official headquarters were at San Carlos of Monterey, but his tours were so frequent that he was rarely there for any length of time.

It was during Lasuén's rule, too, that a forward step was taken in the economic development of the missions. In addition to the normal development in agriculture and stock-raising as well as in the number of the Indians living at the missions.[49] the neophytes received instruction in the trades of the artisan beyond anything they had had before. The friars had already taught their wards all they knew, but desired to perfect them in their employments and make the missions independent of the supply ships from New Spain as much as possible.[50] Acting probably at Lasuén's suggestion Governor Fages wrote to the viceroy in 1787, asking that carpenters, smiths, masons, and other artisans be sent to Alta California to instruct the Indians.[51] About twenty were sent, at royal expense, mostly between 1792 and 1795, on four or five year contracts. A few remained permanently in the province, but most returned to New Spain on the expiration of their contracts.[52] Much of the economic advance of the missions may be attributed to their coming. One wonders, too, how much of the improvement in mission architecture was due to the building or the reconstruction effected by them. Certainly the missions of the earliest days were rude structures,

[47] *Ibid.*, Vol. ii, pp. 543-544.
[48] HITTELL, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 488.
[49] *Cf.* CHAPMAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 427-428.
[50] ENGELHARDT, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 534-535.
[51] CHAPMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 429.
[52] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, p. 615.

while those of the period of Father Lasuén have been almost solely responsible for the "mission style" which is such a characteristic note in the present-day architecture of California.

It is necessary to deal with one other phase of Lasuén's rule, that of his relations with the governors and presidial commanders of the province. Disputes between the religious and the military were a chronic feature of Spanish colonial administration everywhere. Neither element can justly be charged with fault for this situation; it was inherent in the dual system of government employed, where powers were either too loosely defined, or else too specifically stated in some instances which did not fit actual circumstances. Unless both elements were disposed to get along, quarrels were sure to result, and even when they wished to avoid trouble, differences very often occurred. Father Serra was almost incessantly at outs with every governor of the province. He managed best, perhaps, with Pedro Fages during the latter's second term, and yet this same governor had at an earlier time lost his post as a result of Serra's complaints to the viceroy.

Lasuén was fortunate in that the governors with whom he had to deal (Fages, Roméu, Arrillaga, Borica, and Alberni) were reasonable men, eager to have affairs run smoothly when possible. Fages was hot-tempered, but warm-hearted and incapable of harboring a grievance against anybody. He had had many quarrels with Serra, but his long experience as governor and Lasuén's tactfulness enabled him to get over some rough spots in his relations with Lasuén. Borica and Lasuén were devoted friends, but even they could not avoid disputes. One great source of trouble was the provision recommended by Governor Neve in 1779 that in the new missions about to be erected along the Santa Barbara Channel and in others projected for farther inland the friars should exercise merely spiritual jurisdiction, allowing the natives to live in their own towns and make their living in their own way; by this plan it was also hoped to reduce the number of missionaries at a mission from two to one.[53] Lasuén himself wrote to the Father Superior of San Fernando protesting against the change. As his letter throws

[53] ENGELHARDT, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 330-333.

light both on his own character and the hard task of the missionaries in general, it seems worth while to quote some portions of it. With reference to a plan to form the missions into *custodias* under secular control [subject to the newly-appointed bishop of Sonora], Lasuén expressed himself in conformity, since it had the sanction of the Church. It might also serve as "a means for me to depart from this government and this work."[54] As for the Neve plan, if that was to be put into effect without recourse to the Council of the Indies, "I would, without delay and with a clear conscience, do all I could to seize any opportunity which might present itself to retire to the college. . . . This measure, in my private opinion, without setting myself up against the views of others, though they may applaud it, has little of the religious in it, and is reprehensibly full of zeal to save money for the royal treasury. . . . In fine," said Lasuén, after stating the difficult task of the missionaries, "this [new] system would consign a religious to a life that was more than tiresome, to sickness without assistance, and death without sacraments. . . . I cannot believe that His Catholic Majesty likes it, wishes, or will permit that a poor friar suffer such pitiful and grievous desolation, or that he will agree to this unbearable lack of a priest in one's greatest distress, when the friars, in order to serve the king, have deprived themselves of the very delightful company of so many people, or do I think that he will see them left without the help of anyone, when they themselves are being sacrificed for the sake of all. For me the solitude of this occupation is a cruel and terrible enemy which has struck me heavily, like a blow. I escaped from it, thank God, after evident risk of dying on account of it, and now that I see its shadow again, even from afar, I am full of trembling at the mere prospect of having to return to the struggle . . . for it is possible that this misfortune, which I fear worse than death, may fall to my lot. Therefore, if this measure is not revoked, I again declare my positive and supreme repugnance to this religious task, and ask insistently that I be relieved, relying on [the rights granted by] . . . our Franciscan law . . . I would beg, and I do beg,

[54] As a man Lasuén never desired to stay in the Californias. As a religious he accepted with resignation the duty imposed upon him.

leave to go to my province in the Order, or to attach myself to any other whatsoever in the world, for all the evils of any character, save that of sin, seem less to me than that of being alone in this ministry."[55] It will be noticed that Lasuén's protest was very far from being an act of rebellion. The law of his Order gave gave him rights in the matter, and he implied that he would obey if the Council of the Indies or the king should sustain the measure. The horror with which he recalled his service as the sole missionary at Borja and a lurking fear of insanity if he should be required to perform a similar task again seem to underlie his resistance to the plan. And what wonder that he should have felt that way!

As for the change itself, it was not actually put into effect, but the question was raised at the outset of Lasuén's presidency, with respect to the two missions proposed to be founded along the Santa Barbara Channel. The Neve *reglamento* had never been revoked, except that the plan for but a single missionary seems to have been overruled. Even this variation from the original plan was not certainly known in Alta California. It was now directed that the new missions should conform to the Neve arrangement. On the other hand Lasuén received orders from the Father Superior of San Fernando not to found them except upon the old basis. Here then was a situation that had been created neither by Fages nor by Lasuén. Yet, between them they handled it so that it has left but a scant trace on the local records of Alta California. Lasuén had his way without quarreling, and it was tacitly agreed that the missions should be founded on the old basis.[56]

Meanwhile a controvery had been started, prior to Lasuén's installation in office, between Fages and Palóu. This was brought to a head by charges against the Fernandinos made by Fages in September, 1785. It is not necessary here to go into the charges, which were somewhat trivial, but it may be said that Lasuén, upon whom it devolved to draw up the answer, refuted them in a dignified and convincing manner, which virtually settled the dispute. In his report, which he was directing

[55] Lasuén to Francisco Pangua, undated, but probably of the year 1784, in Bancroft Library, *Documentos para la Historia de California*, Vol. iv, pp. 43–50.

[56] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, p. 422.

to the commandant-general of the Provincias Internas, he reverted to the single missionary plan: "I shall not hesitate to give information conducive to that end, if they order me to do so or ask my advice, to the effect that I am utterly opposed, particularly on my own account, as much as it is possible to be opposed, to the project of being alone in a mission. I shall offer myself for any kind of suffering and to die in these parts, as soon as God may order it, but I am certain that there will never be a man who can convince me that I must subject myself to that solitude in this ministry. It seems that this plan has either been abolished or silently passed over, on which account I say no more, but I shall do so whenever occasion demands it."[57]

The dispute between Lasuén and Fages came for solution before the highest authorities in New Spain and Spain, occupying a measure of their attention for a number of years. At length, it was decided, in 1793, to drop the matter.[58] Through Lasuén's skilful management it had died a natural death in Alta California. Thus we find Fages, in his general report of 1787 about the missions, speaking in the highest terms of the missionaries, and nowhere saying anything derogatory of them. One paragraph of this document, though it does not refer directly to Father Lasuén, is worth quoting: "If we are to be just to all [the Fernandinos], as we ought to be, we must confess that the rapid, gratifying, and interesting progress, both spiritual and temporal, which we fortunately are able to see and enjoy in this vast new country, is the glorious effect of the apostolic zeal, activity, and indefatigable ardor of their religious."[59] It would have been difficult for the average individual to speak in this generous manner, unless he were on good terms with those of whom he was speaking. Lasuén must have persuaded Fages to bury the hatchet.

---

[57] Lasuén to Jacobo Ugarte y Loyola, undated, but certified at Monterey as a correct copy on October 25, 1787, in Bancroft Library, *Archivo de la Mision de Santa Bárbara*, Vol. viii, pp. 47–70, especially at pp. 60-61.

[58] CHAPMAN, CHARLES E., *Catalogue of Materials in the Archivo General de Indias for the History of the Pacific Coast and the American Southwest* (Berkeley, 1919), p. 625, item 5280, and documents cited there.

[59] FAGES, *Informe Gral. sobre Misiones*, undated, but of the year 1787, in Bancroft Library, *Archives of California, State Papers, Missions and Colonization*, Vol. i, pp. 124–154, expecially at p. 144, par. 28.

A number of differences arose even in the time of Governor Borica. When the Spanish *pueblo* of Branciforte (modern Santa Cruz) was founded near the mission of Santa Cruz, Lasuén and the other Fernandinos protested. The viceroy sustained Borica, however, and Lasuén had the good sense not to insist upon his point of view.[60] Questions arose also over the instruction of neophytes (mission Indians) by the artisans sent from Mexico, the use of neophytes in pursuit of others who had run away from the missions, and the election of Indian *alcaldes* at the missions. These matters were arranged without undue friction, so that the letter of the law was complied with, but the missionaries were allowed to carry on their affairs much as they had before.[61]

Such differences as these came to the fore now and then to the end of Lasuén's rule and, indeed, thereafter, for they were inseparable from the system of government employed. One of Lasuén's last acts was to assist in defeating an attempt to revive Neve's mission plan. In 1802, he prepared a report opposing the project. The viceroy accepted his conclusions, and the change in the mission system did not take place.[62]

It may fairly be said, however, that Lasuén was able both to maintain harmony with the military and to have his own way in the management of the missions. All his contemporaries spoke highly, even enthusiastically, of him. There can be no doubt that his lovable traits as a man contributed appreciably to his success as an administrator. The sweetness and nobility of his character is attested by foreigners and by Spaniards alike, whose comments are all the more worthy of credence in that they wrote under circumstances which did not require them to set down other than what they really felt. The great French navigator, Lapérouse, visited Monterey in September, 1786. In his description of the province he inclined to disapprove of the mission system, but spoke warmly of the wise and pious conduct of the missionaries. Of the Father-President he says: "Father Fermín de Lasuén, president of the missions of New California,

[60] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, pp. 568-572.

[61] Numerous references to these and other matters appear in BANCROFT, ENGELHARDT, and HITTELL, *q. v.*

[62] ENGELHARDT, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 585–590.

is one of the most worthy of esteem and respect of all the men I have ever met. His sweetness of temper, his benevolence, and his love for the Indians are beyond expression."[63] This tribute is the more striking in that Lapérouse was in Alta California at the time when the quarrel between Fages and Lasuén which began the latter's presidency was at its height. Lapérouse mentions this as follows: "The missionaries, who are so pious, so worthy of respect, are already in open quarrel with the governor, who for his part seemed to me to be a loyal soldier."[64] Thus, Lapérouse, who here and elsewhere evinced his liking for Fages, was not blinded to the merits of the friars, and was able to give the enthusiastic praise of Lasuén quoted above.

Perhaps even more remarkable is the tribute given by the English navigator, Vancouver. Referring to his first meeting with Lasuén, on the occasion of a visit to the mission of San Carlos in December, 1792, Vancouver says: "Our reception at the mission could not fail to convince us of the joy and satisfaction we communicated to the worthy and reverend fathers, who in return made the most hospitable offers of every refreshment their homely abode afforded. On our arrival at the entrance of the Mission the bells were rung, and the Rev. Fermin Francisco de Lasuen, father president of the missionaries of the order of St. Francisco in New Albion,[65] together with the fathers of this mission, came out to meet us, and conduct us to the principal residence of the father president. This personage was about seventy-two years of age, whose gentle manners, united to a most venerable and placid countenance, indicated that tranquilized state of mind, that fitted him in an eminent degree for presiding over so benevolent an institution."[66] So impressed was he by the Father-President that in November, 1793, he gave his name, not once but twice, to the points at the extremities of the Bay of San Pedro, near Los Angeles.[67] These names, "Point Fermin" and "Point Lasuen," are still retained on modern maps. The

[63] Lapérouse, Jean François de Galaup, Comte de, *Voyage de La Pérouse autour du Monde* (Paris, 1798), Vol. ii, p. 300, note.

[64] *Ibid*, Vol. ii, p. 299.

[65] Drake's name for the coast of the Californias, which with Brittanic persistence Vancouver insisted on employing in place of the Spanish name.

[66] Vancouver, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, p. 56.

[67] *Ibid*, Vol. iv, pp. 351–353.

following month, while at San Diego, Vancouver met Lasuén, who had just reached that port during one of his journeys to visit the missions in his charge. Vancouver had been prevented from sailing by unfavorable winds, "but," he says, "I did not regret the detention as it afforded us the pleasure of a visit from our very highly esteemed and venerable friend the father president of the missionaries." Lasuén wished to send to San Juan Capistrano for supplies to "add abundantly to our stock of refreshments," and Vancouver, who expressed himself as "not less thankful for these offices of kindness as convinced of the sincerity with which they were made," states that he "had great difficulty to prevail on the father president to desist from sending to St. Juan's for the supplies he had proposed." Finally, Vancouver writes: "The enjoyment of the society of this worthy character was of short duration; it, however, afforded me the satisfaction of personally acknowledging the obligations we were under for the friendly services that had been conferred upon us, by the missionaries under his immediate direction and government; being perfectly assured, that however well disposed the several individuals might have been to have shewn us the kind attention we had received, the cordial interest with which the father president had, on all occasions, so warmly espoused our interests, must have been of no small importance to our comfort. This consideration, in addition to the esteem I had conceived for his character, induced me to solicit his acceptance of a handsome barrelled organ, which, notwithstanding the vicissitudes of climate, was still in complete order and repair. This was received with great pleasure, and abundant thanks, and was to be appropriated to the use and ornament of the new church at the presidency of the missions at St. Carlos."[68] These statements from an Englishman, who was quite as "British" in his conservatism as the average of his race, in an age when Englishmen felt an antipathy toward Spain and Spaniards on both national and religious grounds, are the strongest possible evidence of the charm of Lasuén's manner and the beauty of his character.

Malaspina, commander of the Spanish voyage of discovery by the ships *Descubierta* and *Atrevida*, was at Monterey in Sep-

[68] *Ibid.*, Vol. iv, pp. 362–364.

tember, 1791. He refers to Lasuén in connection with various interpretations about the reported loss of two boats by the Lapérouse expedition: "Among those who could with the most judgment and knowledge make some interpretations, Fray Matías [*sic*] de Lasuén, of the Order of St. Francis, president of the missions of New California, without doubt deserved the first place. He was a man who in Christian lore, mien, and conduct was truly apostolic, and his good manners and learning were unusual. This religious had with good reason merited the esteem and friendship of both French commanders and the majority of their subordinates."[69]

Bishop Francisco Rouset of Sonora wrote to Father-President Tapis on October 27, 1803, doubtless on receipt of the news of Father Lasuén's death, praising the latter for his religious character and his services. Unfortunately, the exact transcript of his letter is not now at hand.[70]

If further proof were needed of the zeal as a missionary of this great Franciscan it need only be said that he served all the years of his presidency without pay. Salaries were granted only to the two missionaries stationed regularly at each mission. The supernumerary missionaries were without stipend, and, strange to say, the Father-Presidents were reckoned in this category.[71] As Lasuén put it, he lived upon the alms of his Franciscan brethren. This self-sacrifice is not so surprising in itself, for many others were equally without financial reward, but it was particularly hard for Father Lasuén, who had a poor sister, named Clara, about whose welfare he was anxious, for he feared that he must die without having been able to provide for her.[72]

And so at length this man, who had done a life work after most others would have chosen to retire, was himself ready to pass off the scene. Old man that he was, about 83, he had retained his faculties and rendered effective service to the very end. After an illness that confined him to his bed for twelve

[69] Fernández de Navarrete, Martín, *Examen Histórico-Crítico de los Viajes y Descubrimientos Apócrifos*, in *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España* (Madrid, 1849), Vol. xv, p. 315.

[70] Bancroft Library, *Archivo de la Mision de Santa Bárbara*, Vol. xi, p. 100. This is number 8 in a calendar of letters received from the bishops of Sonora.

[71] Bancroft, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. i, p. 578.

[72] Hittell, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 488-489.

days[73] he died at Mission San Carlos on June 26, 1803, and was buried there the next day.[74]

In estimating the greatness of Lasuén's work one is naturally inclined to compare him with his renowned predecessor, Junípero Serra. Bancroft rates Lasuén ahead of Serra,[75] though Engelhardt impugns his motive.[76] It is perhaps unnecessary to choose between them, but, surely, Lasuén worthily filled the post of the great Junípero. As a mission-founder he had achieved as much; indeed it might be argued that he had done more, for he is credited with having inaugurated one of those established during Serra's presidency, while he personally dedicated all of the nine erected in his own term. He travelled fully as much as Father Serra from mission to mission and perhaps more. He baptized a far greater number of Indians in the much shorter period of time during which he was allowed to administer the sacrament of confirmation. He built up the missions economically and architecturally. He was far more successful than Serra in maintaining harmonious relations with the military. In zeal as a Christian and a missionary he equalled, though he could not surpass, Father Junípero. And yet it is perhaps true that the task of Father Serra in a virgin field was the more difficult, and therefore entitled to the greater praise for its successful fulfilment. One wonders, however, if Lasuén might not have done equally well, if the chance had fallen to him. And, furthermore, if Lasuén had had a Palóu to write his biography, might he not have fared nearly as well with posterity? Be that as it may, one may well sympathize with the splendid tribute (omitting all in it that compares Lasuén to Serra) paid to him by Bancroft: "In him were united the qualities that make up the model or ideal padre. . . . In person he was small and compact, in expression vivacious, in manners always agreeable, though dignified. He was a frank, kind-hearted old man, who made friends of all he met. Distinguished visitors of French and English as well as of Spanish blood were impressed in like manner with his sweetness of disposition and quiet force of character.

[73] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 489.
[74] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. ii, p. 8.
[75] *Ibid*, Vol. ii, pp. 8-9.
[76] ENGELHARDT, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 597.

His relations with the college, with the government, and with his band of missionary workers were always harmonious, often in somewhat trying circumstances, though no one of the Franciscans had more clearly defined opinions than he. None of them had a firmer will, or were readier on occasion to express their views. His management of the mission interests for eighteen years affords abundant evidence of his untiring zeal and of his ability as a man of business. His writings . . . prepossess the reader in favor of the author by their comparative conciseness of style. Of his fervent piety there are abundant proofs; and his piety and humility were of an agreeable type, unobtrusive, and blended with common-sense . . . Padre Fermin—as he was everywhere known—to a remarkable degree for his time and environment based his hopes of future reward on purity of life, kindness, and courtesy to all, and a zealous performance of duty as a man, a Christian, and a Franciscan."[77] This from a writer not always in sympathy with the friars should be a measure of the regard in which posterity should hold the memory of the great and lovable California missionary, Fermín Francisco de Lasuén.

CHARLES E. CHAPMAN, PH.D.,
University of California,
Berkeley, Cal.

[77] BANCROFT, *Hist. Cal.*, Vol. ii, pp. 8-9.

CUTHBERT FENWICK—PIONEER CATHOLIC AND LEGISLATOR OF MARYLAND[1]

Before the *Ark* and the *Dove*, bearing their cargoes of men and equipment for a settlement in the New World, reached their destination, Lord Baltimore wrote to his friend, Lord Wentworth, that besides his brothers, Leonard and George Calvert, "very near twenty other gentlemen of very good fashion" had accompanied the enterprise.[2] These twenty or so gentlemen were persons whose wealth enabled them, in addition to defraying the expenses of their transportation, to contribute towards the

[1] The following bibliography shows the list of materials upon which this sketch of Cuthbert Fenwick is built: SOURCES: (*A*) MSS. Wills, deeds and other court documents at Leonardtown and La Plata, Maryland; records of the Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland. (*B*) PRINTED: *Archives of Maryland*, thirty-five volumes; *Publications of the Catholic Record Society* (England), twenty volumes; *Letters and Dispatches of Thomas Wentworth Strafford* (edited by Radcliffe), two volumes London, 1739; SAINT-GEORGE (Richard), *Pedigrees Recorded at the Herald's Visitations of the County of Northumberland* (edited by Joseph Foster), Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1891; WHITE (Andrew, S.J.), *Relatio Itineris in Marylandiam*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publication, No. 7, Baltimore, 1874. The following may also be considered as belonging to the same class of material: *The Calvert Papers*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publication, Nos. 28, 34, 35, Baltimore, 1889–99; BALDWIN (Jane, later Jane Baldwin Cotton), *The Maryland Calendar of Wills*, from 1635 to 1726, Baltimore, 1901–1917; BACON (Thomas), *Laws of Maryland at Large*, Annapolis, 1765; HAYDEN (Horace E.), *Virginia Genealogies*, Wilkes-Barre, 1891; KILTY (John), *The Land-Holder's Assistant and Land-Office Guide*, Baltimore, 1808. WORKS: ALSOP (George), *A Character of the Province of Maryland*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publication, No. 15, Baltimore, 1880; BANCROFT (George), *History of the United States of America*, New York, 1895; BOZMAN (John L.), *A Sketch of the History of Maryland*, Baltimore, 1811, and *The History of Maryland*, two volumes, Baltimore, 1837; BROWN (B. F.) *Maryland not a Roman Catholic Colony*, Baltimore, 1876; BROWNE (William H.), *George and Cecilius Calvert, Barons of Baltimore* (Makers of America Series), New York, 1890, and *Maryland, the History of a Palatinate* (American Commonwealths Series), Boston, 1888; CHALMERS (George), *Political Annals of the Present United Colonies from their Settlement to the Peace of* 1763, two volumes, London, 1780; COBB (Sanford H.), *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, New York, 1902; DAVIS (George L.), *The Day-Star of American Freedom*, New York, 1855; GAMBRALL (Theodore C.), *Studies in the Civil, Social and Ecclesiastical History of Early Maryland*, New York, 1893, and *Church Life in Colonial Maryland*, Baltimore, 1885; HANSON (George A.), *Old Kent of Maryland*, Baltimore, 1876; HAWKS (Francis L.), *A Narrative of Events Connected with the Rise and Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland*, New York, 1839; HODGSON (John), *A History of Northumberland*, two parts in 3 vols., Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1827–1858; HUGHES (Thomas, S. J.), *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, 2 vols. of text, and two parts of Documents, Longmans,

establishment of the proposed colony of Maryland. Others, too, it would seem, of some means but of less rank, were among the passengers on the two staunch little vessels.

The greater number of Maryland's earliest settlers, however, were men of small, if any, worldly possessions. Many of them were unable to meet even the cost of the long voyage across the Atlantic. In the hope of finding a home in the unbroken forests of America where they could worship God freely in accordance with the dictates of their consciences, or of bettering their temporal conditions—perhaps of both—this class of colonists voluntarily bound themselves to the more fortunate settlers whom they were thus obliged, by contract, to serve for a stipulated period in pay-

Green and Co., 1907–1917; INGLE (Edward), *Captain Richard Ingle, the Maryland "Pirate and Rebel,"* Baltimore, 1884; JOHNSON (Bradley T.), *The Foundation of Maryland and the Origin of the Act Concerning Religion*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publication, No. 18, Baltimore, 1883; MCMAHON (John V. L.), *An Historical View of the Government of Maryland*, Baltimore, 1831; MCSHERRY (James), *History of Maryland*, Baltimore, 1848; NEILL (Edward D.), *Terra Mariae*, Philadelphia, 1867, *The Founders of Maryland*, Albany, 1876, and *Thomas Cornwallis and the Early Maryland Colonists*, Boston, 1879; OLDMIXON (John), *The British Empire in America*, 2 vols., London, 1741; RICHARDSON (Hester Dorsey), *Sidelights on Maryland History*, 2 vols., Baltimore, 1913; RIDGELEY (Helen W.), *Historic Graves of Maryland and the District of Columbia*, Grafton Press, 1908; RILEY (Elihu S.), *A History of the General Assembly of Maryland*, Baltimore, 1905; RUSSELL (William T.), *Maryland the Land of Sanctuary*, Baltimore, 1907; SCHARF (Thomas), *History of Maryland*, 3 vols., Baltimore, 1879; SILVER (John Archer), *The Provincial Government of Maryland*, J. H. U. Press, Baltimore, 1895; SMITH (C. Ernest), *Religion under the Barons of Baltimore*, Baltimore, 1879; SPARKS (F. E.), *Causes of the Maryland Revolution of 1689*, J. H. U. Press, Baltimore, 1896; STEINER (Bernard C.), *Beginnings of Maryland*, J. H. U. Press, Baltimore, 1903, *Maryland During the English Civil Wars*, J. H. U. Press, Baltimore, 1903, and *Life of Rev. Thomas Bray*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publication, No. 37, Baltimore, 1901; STOCKBRIDGE (Henry), *The Maryland Archives as Illustrating the Spirit of the Times of the Early Settlers*, Baltimore, 1886; STREETER (Sebastian F.), *Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago*, Baltimore, 1852, and *Papers Relating to the Early History of Maryland*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publication, No. 9, Baltimore, 1876; THOMAS (James W.), *Chronicles of Maryland*, Cumberland, 1913; TREACY (William P.), *Old Catholic Maryland and Its Early Jesuit Missionaries*, 1889; WILHELM (Lewis W.), *Sir George Calvert, Baron of Baltimore*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publication, No. 20, Baltimore, 1884; WILSON (James G.), *A Maryland Manor*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publication, No. 30, Baltimore, 1890; *Ancestral Records and Portraits*, Grafton Press, 1910; *Maryland Historical Magazine, passim*, *American Historical Magazine*, Vol. iv. It must be noted, however, that some of these authors, especially Gambrall and Neill, have suffered themselves to be unduly governed by bias.

[2] *Letters and Dispatches of Thomas Wentworth Strafford* (edited by Radcliffe), Vol. i, pp. 178–179.

ment for their transportation to Lord Baltimore's palatinate. Later, such immigrants pledged their services to merchants or masters of ships, who not infrequently let or sold the labor thus due to them to the wealthier planters.

Those who came to the province in this humble capacity were known as "redemptioners" or indentured servants. Those who emigrated at their own expense were called freemen. The term of servitude for the former ran, as a rule, from two to five years, according to age, value of services and other circumstances. When the time of their contracts expired, they also became freemen, immediately enjoying equal civic rights and privileges with the independent colonists, and were entitled to a certain portion of land for themselves, their wives and their children.

Prior to the "Protestant Revolution" of 1689, at least, a large proportion of the colony's population, attracted perhaps no less by the tolerance of the first two lords proprietary than by the large prospects offered by their generous government, came to Maryland under such conditions. To come in this status was then considered no disgrace. In fact, many who arrived indentured for their passage money soon rose to prominence after obtaining their freedom, and married into the best colonial families. Some, indeed, of the most honored names in Maryland's history were either redemptioners or the descendants of redemptioners. Among this class, in the early days of the province, were Catholics of equally as high birth and breeding as the some twenty or so "gentlemen of very good fashion" of whom Lord Cecilius Calvert wrote his friend. Doubtless the reduced circumstances of these were largely due to the fines and confiscations to which those of their faith were subjected by the odious laws that then existed in the mother-country, and that brought many of the wealthiest and noblest of the fine old English Catholic families to abject poverty.

Such an adventurer was the subject of this sketch, Cuthbert Fenwick. Fenwick was a scion of one of England's oldest and staunchest Catholic families. No doubt it was the training that he received at home that made him one of the most striking figures in early Maryland and one of the most influential builders of the colony, during the first two decades of its history, as well as "the fairest exponent of that system of religious liberty which had con-

stituted the very corner-stone of the first settlement under the charter" procured by Cecilius Calvert, the lord proprietary.[3]

Long-standing traditions, when traced to their sources, are generally discovered to have had their origin in historic truth. So it has proved in the present instance. Tradition had long connected the Fenwicks of Maryland, through their first American forebear, Cuthbert Fenwick, with the Fenwicks of Fenwick Tower, Northumberland County, England. But the actual mention of the name "Cuthberte" in its proper place in the family annals in Great Britain, together with the incessant recurrence of the same Christian names in the colony, seems positively and definitely to establish the identity of the "Lord of Fenwick Manor," Maryland, and to place beyond dispute his connection with the historic family of the same patronymic in the north of England.[4] Thus, though he came to America as a redemptioner, Cuthbert Fenwick could possibly boast of the oldest, if not the noblest, lineage among the early settlers of the Baltimore palatinate.

The Fenwicks of Northumberland, England, can be traced back to the twelfth century. The principal house of the family was that of Fenwick Tower, not far from Newcastle-upon-Tyne. In course of time, however, numerous cadet branches came into existence, spreading the influence of the line widely through the north.[5] Their loyalty to the Catholic faith is said to have been

---

[3] DAVIS, *The Day-Star of American Freedom*, p. 207.

[4] SAINT-GEORGE, *Pedigrees Recorded at the Herald's Visitations of the County of Northumberland*, p. 50; HODGSON, *A History of Northumberland*, Vol. ii of Part ii, p. 75.

[5] SAINT-GEORGE, *op. cit.*, pp. 50–55, and HODGSON, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76 and 112–114, show that the early Maryland colonist belonged to the cadet houses of Longshows or Langshaws and Nunriding. William B. Goodwin of Columbus, Ohio, who has for many years been making a thorough study, from authentic sources, of the Fenwicks, both in England and America, has given us the following pedigree of the Cuthbert Fenwick who came to Maryland with its first settlers: (1) Robert de Fenwick, about 1190, Ville de Fenwick. (2) Robert de Fenwick, son and heir, about 1230, Ville de Fenwick. (3) Thomas de Fenwick, third son of —— Fenwick, possessor of the Manor of Capheaton, afterwards sold to the Swinburns; also later Prior of Hexham Abbey. (4) Sir Thomas de Fenwick, Knight of the Manor of Fenwick. (5) Alan de Fenwick, of Fenwick, third son. (6) Sir John de Fenwick, Knight of Fenwick. (7) Sir John de Fenwick, second son, knighted in the French War by King Henry V and given the motto "*Perit ut vivat*" and the Manor of Trouble Ville, in Normandy. In this generation Fenwick Tower descended to Sir John's

long the most steadfast. The records of England's dark penal days, imperfect and incomplete though they are, bear mute but eloquent testimony to the fidelity of many of them to their religion, as well as of the fines imposed upon them for having the courage to be recusants in the face of laws most intolerant. It is not improbable, indeed, that the family of Cuthbert had been thus reduced to straits that obliged him to come to America as a redemptioner.

But if he were a passenger on the *Ark* or the *Dove*, which, as will be seen, is more than likely, another explanation might be advanced for his emigrating in so humble a capacity. The young man's conscience might have forbidden him to take the prescribed test oath; and to avoid so odious a thing he elected to enlist in Lord Baltimore's enterprise among the adventurers indentured to others, whose oaths seem to have sufficed for those under their care. Yet he appears to have arrived in the colony a poor man.

In any case, the noble youth had not less to expect in the New World than in the Old. At home, one of his faith could look for little or nothing except trouble and persecution. In the broad domains of America, and under the kindly and tolerant rule of a man like Cecilius Calvert, he might hope to plant his name and posterity forever. It may be, too, that he had in him some of the spirit of adventure which was then rife among those of his class and age in Great Britain. Thus more than one influence, perchance, had its part in bringing to Maryland one of the most charming personages of her early history.

The young cavalier's father was George Fenwick of Longshows, or Langshaws, a cadet branch of the main line of Fenwick Tower. In the family there were nine children, six boys and three girls. Cuthbert, as is shown by Foster's pedigrees of Northumberland, was the fourth son, and was living in 1615. The precise date of

---

elder brother, Sir Alan de Fenwick. (8) John Fenwick, to whom his father gave Newburne Hall. (9) Sir Roger Fenwick, fourth son, Constable of Newcastle and Esquire of the Body to King Henry VII. (10) Sir Ralph Fenwick, Knight, who married the sole heiress of —— Mitford of Stanton. (11) Anthony Fenwick, second son, who received the house of Langshaws from his mother. (12) Stephen Fenwick of Langshaws, son and heir. (13) George Fenwick of Langshaws, living in 1615. (14) Cuthbert Fenwick, fourth son, whose eldest brother, William, son and heir of George mentioned above, was 12 years of age in 1615.

his birth is not known; but his own testimony, given in April, 1654, that he was then forty years of age, "or thereabouts,"[6] proves that he was born probably in 1613 or 1614, making him twenty or twenty-one years old when he landed on the shores of the New World.

Both the time of his arrival in Maryland and whether he was a passenger on the *Ark* or the *Dove* have been subjects of discussion. The difficulty arises from a petition of Thomas Cornwallis, made in 1652, for grants of land in virtue of having "transported" twenty-two servants into the colony from 1633 to that date. Amongst these servants he mentions Cuthbert Fenwick as one of four whom he "brought and exported" from Virginia in 1634. But against this record we have two others, both belonging to 1639, and in both of which Fenwick is mentioned just as explicitly as one of ten men-servants whom the wealthy landholder brought "into the province in 1633."[7] These two entries, dating as they do from a period much nearer Fenwick's arrival in the settlement, ought to outweigh the single statement of later years, when lapse of time, pressure of business and the increased number of imported persons all conspired to make the memory less clear and trustworthy. The argument is all the stronger in view of the careless manner in which records of that day were written, and of the almost verbal agreement of the two earlier entries of Cornwallis' claims.

Again, the fact that Cuthbert Fenwick's name appears as one of the witnesses to the will of George Calvert, a brother of the lord proprietary and the governor, July 10, 1634, shows that he must have been among the early settlers long enough to win the

[6] *Archives of Maryland* (Vol. x), *Judiciary and Testamentary Business*, 1649/50–1657, p. 372.

[7] Land Records at Annapolis, Liber 1, p. 110; *ibid.*, Liber A. B. H., pp. 94 and 343–44. See also RICHARDSON, *Sidelights on Maryland History*, Vol. i, pp. 12, 14, 15, 417. Mrs. Richardson, it seems to us, by no means substantiates her claim that Cuthbert Fenwick was not a passenger on the *Ark* or the *Dove*. And it should be borne in mind here that the words "transported" and "imported," so often found in the early Maryland records, had not then the ugly meaning which they came to have later. They simply meant the payment of the colonists' fare to the New World. Not unfrequently do we find a man claiming land for the "transportation" of his wife or child, or even of himself. After all, it may very well be that Fenwick was merely in the employment of Cornwallis; and that the commissioner and councilor brought him over to look after his business as his attorney.

confidence of those in charge of the province.[8] But this would hardly have been possible had he not come in the *Ark* or the *Dove*. Tradition also, of long standing, insists on placing the distinguished pioneer legislator among the original group of adventurers who landed on Saint Clement's Island and offered up the holy sacrifice of the Mass, March 25, 1634, the first day of the new year according to the old Julian Calendar.

The little documentary discrepancy might be explained on the supposition that Fenwick remained for a time in Virginia, where we know the pilgrims tarried for more than a week on their journey, to transact business for his master, Cornwallis, and then continued his way to Maryland. But be this as it may, the young scion of the noble house of Fenwick Tower did not long remain subject to Cornwallis. The treatment that he received from this high-minded gentleman was most kindly and generous. Indeed, because of the esteem in which he was held by his patron, and the exceptional advantages he derived from intimate association with such a man, it was perhaps fortunate for the young cavalier that he fell, at that period of his life and in a new, uncivilized country, under the wholesome influence of a person of Cornwallis' character. Cornwallis was a leader among the colonists and one of the two commissioners appointed by Lord Baltimore to assist Governor Calvert in the affairs of the province. From the start, he seems not merely to have placed implicit confidence in Fenwick's honesty, but to have entrusted matters of much moment to his prudence, judgment and ability. A perusal of the records that still remain tempts us to believe that the commissioner regarded Cuthbert Fenwick as a friend, an adviser and an associate rather than as one in his employment.

They were both possessed of rare parts, splendid characters, tireless energy, and unimpeachable integrity. Both were just such men as were needed to build up a commonwealth in the primeval forests of the New World. Kindred spirits, they appear to have been inseparable, and to have acted together—at least from the time Fenwick obtained his freedom—in all important concerns of the province during most of the first two decades of its existence. Indeed, almost from the beginning we see Fenwick,

[8] *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. i, pp. 363-64.

although a young man in his twenties, acting as the commissioner's attorney to look after his business and vast estates, not only during his visits to England and absences on matters of colonial or personal interest, but when he was at home. For this reason, although married, having a family of his own, and possessing broad acres in his own right, Cuthbert Fenwick long lived —perhaps until 1651—at Cornwallis' manor, known as The Cross.[9]

In March, 1638, Fenwick sat in the colonial assembly of freemen called to consult for the welfare of the budding state. It was the second meeting of the kind in the province, but the first of which we have any satisfactory account. For Cuthbert Fenwick it marked the beginning of a notable career in what was to become the Lower House of the General Assembly. Taking an active part in the deliberations of this legislative body, whose proceedings are among the most noteworthy in the Maryland colonial records, he becomes at once a man of mark, as well as a conspicuous, historic personage. His rise was rapid, and thenceforth, to the time of his death, he figured prominently in the legislative meetings of Provincial Maryland. On one occasion, during the absence of Cornwallis, whose attorney he was, he sat by special summons of Leonard Calvert in the governor's council to take the place of the commissioner.[10] It would seem, indeed, that he was the only man to receive such a peculiar order in the history of the colony.

A man of sterling worth and inflexible honesty, possessed of a charming character which he appears to have handed down to his posterity, Cuthbert Fenwick won the confidence and goodwill of his fellow-colonists, both bond and free. The record of his voting at the assemblies of which he was a member show that, gentle and considerate though he was, he had a will that refused to be swerved from what he felt to be his duty. On various occasions he is found taking sides against the governor and his council and secretary. Once he cast his vote against a measure that was favored by all his associates.[11]

[9] It is remarkable how often the names of Fenwick and Cornwallis are linked together in the records of the day.

[10] *Archives of Maryland* (Vol. i), *Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly*, 1637/38–1664, pp. 88–89.

[11] *Archives of Maryland*, Vols. i, iii, iv and x, *passim*.

Few, if any, of the original colonists were more frequently members of the legislative body than Cuthbert Fenwick. His political life, however, may be said to have reached its climax in the assemblies of 1849 and 1850. In the former, which is specially noted for passing the historic act of religious toleration, he was the first member of the Financial Committee. Davis is of the opinion that he was probably also the speaker of the Lower House on this occasion.[12] We may imagine the interest that one of his staunch Catholic faith took in the "Act Concerning Religion" at a time when everything boded so ill for his Church and faith. In the Protestant assembly of 1650 he was chairman of a joint committee on "Laws and Orders," composed of several members of both houses.

The assembly of 1650 was controlled by the Puritans, who, apparently in a spirit of religious bias, imposed an oath of secrecy upon its members. For refusing to take the oath Thomas Matthews, the Catholic burgess elected by Saint Inigoes' Hundred, Saint Mary's County, was expelled from the Lower House. Cuthbert Fenwick was then chosen by the same voters to succeed the ejected member. But Fenwick also scented danger in the measure, for he had been a victim of religious intolerance both in England and in Maryland. He saw only too clearly that an assembly sworn to secrecy would be a dangerous weapon in the hands of those whom he had every reason to fear might be disposed to use it against those of his faith. Like Matthews, he refused to take the oath, unless assured that it contained nothing opposed to his religion or his conscience. Though he was told that he would be expelled from his seat, if he did not take the oath of secrecy without limitation or reserve, by tactful prudence and firmness he managed not merely to retain his place, but to elicit from the legislative body a declaration that they had never intended to bind any member in a way that would infringe upon his religion or trespass upon his conscience.[13] In view of the

[12] DAVIS, *op. cit.*, p. 212. Some writers question Davis' supposition that the assembly sat in two houses before 1650. But BACON (*Laws of Maryland at Large*—study on the Assembly of 1649), BOZMAN (*History of Maryland*, Vol. ii, p. 349), BANCROFT (*History of the United States of America*, Vol. i, p. 169), and other authors of note are of the same opinion as Mr. Davis.

[13] *Archives of Maryland* (Vol. i), *Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly*, 1637/38–1664, pp. 237*ff* and 273*ff*.

strong Puritan prejudices of the day, this was not only a notable triumph for the clever legislator; it was a victory of importance. As is shown by Maryland's subsequent history, Fenwick understood the trend of the day and set himself to counteract its consequences.

From the time he obtained his freedom, he is styled "Cuthbert Fenwick, Gentleman." Governor Calvert, representing Lord Baltimore, calls him, in official documents, "Our trusty Cuthbert, Gentleman"; or "Our beloved Cuthbert Fenwick, Gentleman." Indeed the title "Gentleman," which in those days had a special significance as implying nobility of birth, is rarely ever omitted from his name in the records of the times.

Few men of his day were the recipients of so many signs of goodwill from his fellow-colonists, or of so many commissions of trust and confidence, as Cuthbert Fenwick. Few were more frequently employed in the service of the province. Time and again was he appointed to positions that demanded good judgment and no little courage.

In 1635 he fought side by side with Thomas Cornwallis, who commanded two armed vessels of the governor, and defeated William Clayborne's pirates under Ratcliff Warren in an engagement on the eastern side of the Chesapeake, not far from the shore of the present Somerset County.[14] In 1638 he was chosen to aid the government in regulating trade with the colony and between the colonists and the Indians. In the fulfilment of this office he obtained information in regard to the murder of Rowland Williams, at Accomac, by the Nanticokes that determined Maryland and Virginia to unite for the punishment of that tribe. Again, he was commissioned, with Capt. John Hollis, to arrest all persons suspected of illicit trading with the red man; and again, in 1644, he was made a member of a council to be consulted by Capt. Henry Fleet, who was sent to conclude a treaty of peace with the Susquehannas and "Patowmecks," or to declare war against them, as circumstances demanded.[15] In 1643 he went to Boston, aboard *The Thomas*, as an officer, to keep order

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 17, and Vol. iv, *Judicial and Testamentary Business of the Provincial Court*, pp. 21–23; BOZMAN, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 35, 65–66.

[15] *Archives of Maryland* (Vol. iii), *Proceedings of the Council of Maryland*, 1636–1667, pp. 73, 74, 84, 148–150; DAVIS, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

among the sailors.[16] Likely, indeed, he was the bearer of the historic letter of Governor Calvert to Captain Gibson inviting the settlers of New England persecuted by the Puritans to make their homes in Maryland, where they could enjoy the blessings of religious freedom. In 1644 he was appointed to a commissionership in St. Mary s County, "an office out of which grew that of the early county court judge."[17] In the rebellion (1645) of Richard Ingle and William Clayborne, he remained faithfully at his post of duty, was made prisoner by the adherents of these two evil geniuses of the province, and subjected to many hardships and indignities.[18]

Though favor and regard were shown him by the governor, this did not prevent Cuthbert Fenwick from being a champion of the rights and the liberties of the people. More than once we find him a member of a committee, of which he was the chairman, appointed to draw up a list of the grievances of the freemen of the colony or to draft the laws which they wished to have enacted. Of the innumerable juries on which he served, he was almost uniformly the foreman. Again and again his name appears as the executor or administrator of estates; as the appraiser of property; as a delegate to take or pass judgment on an inventory; as an arbitrator of difficulties, either chosen by the court or selected by the parties concerned; as the attorney of people of every station of life to prosecute or to defend their cause before the Assembly.[19]

Although the historians of Maryland have done little more for this interesting and deserving personage than to preserve his memory, the colonial records for nearly a score of years are fairly burdened with the repetition of Cuthbert Fenwick's name. With the exception of Thomas Cornwallis, perhaps no other man of the time was more intensely engaged, or took a more prominent part in the affairs of the little colony along the Chesapeake Bay. None manifested a keener interest in its welfare.

[16] *Ibid. Archives of Maryland* (Vol. iv), *Judicial and Testamentary Business of the Provincial Court*, 1637–1650, p. 204.

[17] *Ibid.* (Vol. iii), *Proceedings of the Provincial Court*, 1636–1667, pp. 150–151; DAVIS, *op. cit.*, p. 212; BOZMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 280.

[18] *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. iv, as above, *passim*, and Vol. x, as above, pp. 253-254, 371–373; DAVIS, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

[19] *Archives of Maryland*, Vols. i, iv, and x, as above, *passim*.

The chronicles show him to have been a man of wide activities and a leader in all that made for good. His was a record of which Maryland and his numerous descendents may justly be proud.

It was but natural that a man of such splendid capacity and tireless activity should rapidly accumulate a competent fortune, even in a country so new and uncultivated as Maryland then was. Only a few years, in fact, had passed before we find Cuthbert Fenwick one of the largest taxpayers in the colony, indicating that he was one of the largest property holders. His rise was the result, not of fortune or accident, but of character, industry and ability. Strength of purpose and singleness of mind stand out as prominent traits of all his life.

Of Cuthbert Fenwick's educational opportunities nothing is definitely known. Yet, while we find no record positively stating that he was a barrister or legal practitioner, the frequency with which he acted as attorney for the colonists, not only to transact their business but to prosecute or to defend their cause before the court, and the acquaintance which he seems to have had with the nice points and technicalities of law, would indicate that he was a man of culture and possessed of no mean knowledge of jurisprudence, if not a lawyer. For a time he was one of a committee of three appointed to "hear and determine" all causes in the province, whether civil or criminal, "not extending to life or member."[20] In his capacity of attorney for Cornwallis he showed his fearless spirit by bringing suit (1644-1645) against Governor Calvert for 100,000 pounds of tobacco, then the legal tender of the country. The case is one of the most interesting and instructive in the early annals of the colony, and shows that Fenwick possessed considerable skill in the management of such proceedings.[21]

But the sturdy pioneer was not merely a leader in civic matters. Staunch and practical in his faith, he was likewise prominent and active in the affairs of his Church. Withal he was humble and unpretentious.

[20] *Archives of Maryland* (Vol. iii), *Proceedings of the Provincial Court*, 1636–1667, pp. 150–151.

[21] *Ibid.* (Vol. iv), *Judicial and Testamentary Business of the Provincial Court*, pp. 292–294.

From the outset, he was a steadfast and special friend and adviser of the Jesuit Fathers, Maryland's earliest missionaries, as whose trusted agent he acted in the management of their temporalities. They placed implicit confidence in his judgment and integrity. Nor did he hesitate to defend them in misunderstandings with such men as John Lewger (Secretary of the Province), Governor Calvert and the lord proprietary. Doubtless it was in this way that were laid the foundations of a lasting and extraordinary friendship towards that distinguished body of ecclesiastics, which may be noticed to this day among Cuthbert Fenwick's descendants in Maryland. Beginning with one of Cuthbert's own sons, it is remarkable how many of them, as a result no doubt of this devotion, have borne the baptismal name of Ignatius, after the sainted founder of that institute, since the days of their forefather who helped to lay the cornerstone of the "Land of Sanctuary."

As has been stated, Fenwick seems to have lived at The Cross, the manorial home of Capt. Thomas Cornwallis, until 1651. But in this year he received from Lord Baltimore a grant of 2,000 acres of land lying on the Patuxent River and adjoining the historic De La Brooke Manor, which belonged to Robert Brooke.[22] To this new estate, whither he appears to have moved at once, Fenwick gave the name of Saint Cuthbert's, in honor of his patron saint. Even in his lifetime, however, it was commonly called Fenwick Manor, and was so known for more than a century. Thereafter he devoted his talents largely to the cultivation of his property and to beautifying his home, in which he perhaps hoped that his name might be perpetuated in the New World.

Unfortunately, his days were cut short, when in the prime of life. He was but one or two and forty years of age at the time. As may be seen from his will and that of his wife, he did not live to erect the mansion he proposed to place on Saint Cuthbert's Manor, but died in a house constructed on another part of his plantation lying on a branch of Saint Cuthbert's Creek. The precise time of his death is not known. His will, however, signed March 6, 1655 (Old Style, 1654), and the appointment of

[22] The Land Records, Annapolis, Liber A. B. H., p. 158, show that this estate was surveyed for Cuthbert Fenwick, April 24, 1651.

Mrs. Fenwick as administratrix of his estate by the court, April 24, 1655, show that he died between these two dates.[23] The assembly of October and court of December, 1654, by indicating his presence at their transactions, prove that he remained active unto the end. One regrets the loss to the young Catholic colony in being thus deprived of so capable a man in the heyday of his vigorous mentality and at the height of his usefulness.

Cuthbert Fenwick was twice married. Of his first wife, the date of the marriage or that of her death no record has been discovered. But his relations with Cornwallis cause one to fancy that she was a near relation, perhaps a daughter, of that early commissioner and councilor. She left her husband four children—Thomas (doubtless so named after Cornwallis), Cuthbert, Ignatius and Teresa. In 1649 he was again joined in holy wedlock—this time with Mrs. Jane Eltonhead Moryson, widow of Robert Moryson of Kecoughtan (now Hampton), Va.[24] The second Mrs. Fenwick was a daughter of Richard Eltonhead of Eltonhead, Lancashire, England, and belonged to a family perhaps not less distinguished than that of Fenwick himself. Her brother, the Hon. William Eltonhead, a member of the Maryland Colonial Council, was put to death by the Puritans in 1655. The fruit of this marriage was three sons—Robert, Richard and John. Cuthbert Fenwick was survived by all his children, except Thomas, whose early death is indicated by the absence of his name from the wills of both his father and his stepmother.

The early Catholic legislator, one cannot but believe, was a devoted husband and a fond father. At the time of his death he possessed some thousands of acres of land, lying along the beautiful Patuxent River and extending, Thomas tells us, from the present Cat Creek to Saint Cuthbert's (now Cuckold) Creek.[25] To his wife he bequeathed the land west of Deep

[23] Cuthbert Fenwick's will is in Liber S of the Provincial Court Records, pp. 219–220. (Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland.)

[24] Fenwick's marriage contract with the Widow Moryson is in Liber S of the Provincial Court, pp. 218-219, and bears the date of August 1, 1649. (Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland.)

[25] THOMAS, *Chronicles of Colonial Maryland* (1913 ed.), p. 360.

Branch at St. Cuthbert's Neck absolutely and plantation during life. The residue of his real estate he willed to be equally divided between his sons, Cuthbert, Ignatius, Robert, Richard and John; except that the eldest, who bore his own Christian name, and who was "to be the Lord of the Manor" and to have Saint Cuthbert's proper for his plantation, was to receive an extra one hundred acres. Teresa's portion, as was often the custom with daughters in times past, consisted of personalty. The Church was remembered in the persons of Fathers Starkey and Fitzherbert.

As the children were still minors, Mrs. Fenwick was appointed their guardian. Being a woman of business ability, affairs continued to prosper under her administration. But, unfortunately she did not long survive her husband, a circumstance that seems to have caused the youthful family, thus left without the guidance of her good judgment, considerable inconvenience. This, however, they were able to overcome as they grew in age and experience.

Jane Eltonhead Fenwick's will is dated November 24, 1660, and was probated December 12, 1660. It shows that she divided the land left her by her husband into three parts, called the "home plantation," "Little Fenwick," and "Mousier's Plantation." These she ordered to be equally distributed among her three sons, Robert, Richard and John. To her stepchildren, Cuthbert, Ignatius and Teresa, she gave servants, stock and other personalty. Like her husband, Mrs. Fenwick did not forget the Church in her last will and testament. The document is evidence of the bond of unity and harmony and affection and mutual confidence that existed in the family; for she appointed her stepsons, Cuthbert and Ignatius, on attaining the legal age of one and twenty years, guardians of her own children during their minority.[36] It is worthy of note that no little value and interest attach to her will as giving a fair idea of the home comforts, the wardrobe of colonial dames, and the household furnishings among the wealthier of Maryland's early settlers. It throws much light upon an important branch of history, the social and domestic life of the past.

[36] Mrs. Fenwick's will is in Will Book No. 1, pp. 114*ff*. (Land Office, Annapolis.)

The story of Maryland—the most elite of the Anglo-American colonies—is the most glorious of our colonial days, until religious bias and intolerance begin to mar its beauty. Cuthbert Fenwick was a leader in the making of that history. His spirit of honesty and fraternal charity, as his kindly, even disposition and judicial temperament, not only caused him to be trusted and respected by all, but made for the peace, harmony and prosperity of the palatinate. He was a man of the same caliber and spirit as the first two Lords Baltimore, Leonard Calvert, Thomas Cornwallis and other champions of religious toleration. A steadfast and practical Catholic, he stood boldly for his faith and in defense of liberty of conscience. His actions were ever characterized by good judgment, and a sane, independent conservatism. Always the gentleman, courteous of manner and generous of heart, Fenwick must have been as a ray of sunshine for the pioneer settlers in their hard lives amid the gloomy forests of Maryland.

Robert Fenwick, Cuthbert's eldest son by his second marriage, is said to have died young. And as from 1663, when he had not yet attained his majority, we find no further mention in the colonial registers of Ignatius, born of the first marriage, it would seem that he also died early and without issue. Of Teresa, the only daughter, there is no trace after the death of her stepmother. John, the youngest of the family, appears to have left no descendants. Cuthbert and Richard are soon seen rising in the esteem of the colony and receiving appointments as Justices of the Peace, an important position in the early days. The former, however, drops from the records in 1676, which is supposed to be the year of his death. He is said to have left one child, a daughter, who married but had no issue.

Thus, it would appear, all the Fenwicks of the Catholic line of Maryland came from Richard, the early legislator's second son by Jane Eltonhead. Yet it was a prolific race, and increased rapidly. But anti-Catholic prejudice had now gained the upper hand in the colony. All enjoyed toleration, except those of the faith of the first two lords proprietary who had established the palatinate as a home for religious liberty. Catholics, sad to say, could no longer hope for preference or to hold positions of profit, honor or trust. This was forbidden by law. From 1689, the year

of the "Protestant Revolution," therefore, until the struggle for independence, we find no record of the Fenwicks taking part in affairs of state. They continued, however, generally to prosper, even under the drastic restrictions placed upon the adherents of their religion, to stand high in the community, and to exert a wholesome influence for the good of the province.

It took the American Revolution of 1774-1783 to tear down the barriers of intolerance against the Catholics in a colony that had been established by Catholics as an asylum for religious toleration. From that time we see the descendants of the sturdy pioneer lawmaker, together with their co-religionists, coming again into their rights. When the Anglo-American colonies formed their union to resist the unjust encroachments of the mother-country, the Fenwicks rallied gallantly to the standard of freedom and independence. Foremost among them was Col. Ignatius Fenwick, father of the future Dominican priest and bishop of Cincinnati, Ohio.[27]

The good that is in parents is said to pass from generation to generation. Thus Maryland's pioneer Catholic legislator, Cuthbert Fenwick, seems to have transmitted his sturdy character to his posterity. To this day it continues to be a trait among his descendants. They have been important *personae* (despite political disabilities) in the drama of Colonial Maryland and in the later history of the State. They have been almost uniformly true to the religion of their original progenitor. As many of them intermarried with the leading families of their own faith, his blood runs in the veins of the best Catholic circles of what was once Lord Baltimore's palatinate. Some of them, it is true, have occasionally joined lives with those not of the Church. But their fidelity was such that, if they did not make converts of those with whom they were united in wedlock, their children were, as a rule, brought up to be steadfast in their adherence to the Church of Rome. Although few patronymics are more common in Maryland, rarely does one meet with a Fenwick who does not profess fidelity to Christ's Vicar on earth. As a noted Protestant author expresses it, "Through evil, and through good, after the lapse of many years, in the midst of vast social

[27] *Archives of Maryland* (Vol. xviii), *Muster Rolls, passim,* give the names of a number of Fenwicks who served in the Revolutionary War.

and political revolutions, they have clung with the fondness of children to the faith of their first forefather."[28] Nor is this true only of those who remained in the place of their origin. It is perhaps equally true of those descended from the same line in Kentucky, Missouri, and other parts of the South and West.

Like their first American forebear again, everywhere have they been conspicuous for their civic virtues. Everywhere, in wealth or in poverty, in fortune good or ill, they have stood high in the localities in which they lived. Without fear of contradiction may it be said that few other Maryland families have so faithfully maintained the best traditions of their colonial sires. From the beginning of the stormy days that led to the American Revolution to the present time, many have been the responsible positions, civil, military and political, filled with credit by descendants of Cuthbert Fenwick. So also have they been among our most highly honored and deeply respected Catholic clergy and hierarchy. Not a few have entered various sisterhoods in different parts of the country. No doubt the blood and character inherited from the pioneer Catholic legislator, together with the careful religious training so uniformly given their children by parents of this stock, had their share in the formation and development of these vocations.

Two of the Catholic pioneer's descendants, Right Rev. Edward D. Fenwick, O.P., and Right Rev. Benedict J. Fenwick, S.J., were respectively the first Bishop of Cincinnati and the second of Boston. Another, Rev. Enoch Fenwick, S.J., was mentioned for a mitre more than once. Rev. John C. Fenwick was the first English-speaking American to enter the Order of Saint Dominic, Rev. George Fenwick, S.J., was a distinguished educator. The last of the name to be raised to the priesthood is Rev. Francis L. Fenwick, S.J., ordained the past year Three other clergymen whom we recall, of a different patronymic, but descended from the early law-giver, were Revs. Nicholas D. Young, O.P., Nicholas R. Young, O.P., and Benjamin Young, S.J. Time and space do not permit us to attempt an enumeration of those of his posterity who have attained distinction in the civil life.

---

[28] DAVIS, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

Cuthbert Fenwick, though of a noble family, needed no blazonry of rank or factitious honor of ancestry to give him a standing and influence in the colony which he helped to plant. His own sterling qualities and unselfish devotion to the public welfare made him a power for good, as well as brought him the regard that he richly deserved. A man whose presence would be desirable in any community, he was all-important in an enterprise like that of Lord Baltimore. No doubt, like every good man, he left his impress upon the colony, and the character which it continued to maintain, in spite of revolution and intolerance, was in no small measure due to his influence.

V. F. O'DANIEL, O.P., S.T.M.,
Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE CHURCH IN NORTH AMERICA (GREENLAND) IN THE MIDDLE AGES

I

Some time in the second half of the tenth century, perhaps in the decade following 970, there came to Iceland a Norwegian immigrant, Eric Thorwaldsson by name, though usually known as Eric the Red. The early settlers of Iceland, the men who had "taken land" two or three generations before, had appropriated the better part of the country, and Eric was forced to set up his homestead in the bleak and barren wastes on the northwestern shores of the island. Later he moved farther south into the more interesting and hospitable region of Broadfirth. Eric the Red was of a restless disposition; he was proud and wilful and had an unruly temper. He had been forced to leave Norway because of man-slaying and in Iceland, too, he found it difficult to avoid the bloodfeud. During his brief stay on the island he was twice found guilty of bloodshed, with the result that he and his entire household were finally outlawed.

There was a story current in Iceland of one Gunnbjörn whose ship had been driven westward many years before till it touched a new land which the Icelanders called Gunnbjörn's-reef. Eric the Red had for some time been preparing for a voyage, and soon after the moot had acted on the charges against him, he quietly sailed his ship out of Broadfirth and entered the unknown seas.

Three years later Eric returned to Broadfirth. He had found the "reef" and had named it Greenland, "for he said that men would be the more ready to go thither if it had a good name." He made peace with his chief enemy in Iceland and began to seek recruits for a colonizing venture in the new land. In this he was immediately successful; the summer after his return twenty-five ships sailed to Greenland, of which only fourteen were able to complete the perilous journey; the rest were wrecked or driven back to Iceland. Are the Priest, who inserted an account of the settlement of Greenland in his "Book of Settlements," states that the colony was founded "sixteen winters before Christendom was made law in Iceland."[1] This calculation would

[1] *Landnáma-bóc*, ii, c. 12 (VIGFUSSON and POWELL, *Origines Islandicae*, i, 72–76). *Cf.* (ARE, *Libellus Islandorum*, c. 6 (*ibid.*, 294).

place the event in the summer of 984. Other sources place it a year or two later. The annalists seem to favor 986.[2]

About forty or fifty miles northwest of Cape Farewell the coast line is broken by a series of fjords that run far back into the land. Here (in the present Julianehaab district) Eric had decided to plant his colony. His own homestead he located at Brentlithe on the Ericsfirth, which became in a sense the center and the capital of the settlement. Most of his followers built their homes in this lower fjord district, but a smaller number sailed some two hundred miles farther to the northwest where another series of fjords offered favorable conditions for settlement. Thus there grew up two colonies, the smaller West Settlement in the present Godthaab area and the larger East Settlement farther down the coast.

The men and women who settled Greenland doubtless all, or nearly all, worshipped according to heathen rites. They cannot, however, have been wholly unacquainted with the Christian faith, for in 981 or thereabouts one Frederick, a German missionary (he is called bishop in the Icelandic sources), had begun to preach the Christian gospel to the Icelanders, though with no appreciable success.[3] Both Iceland and Greenland accepted Christianity about the year 1000, the conversion being due largely to the missionary zeal of the king of Norway.

In the summer of 999, Leif, the son of Eric the Red, made a journey to Norway and spent the following winter at the court of Olaf Trygvesson. The king took a liking to the young Greenlander and asked him to undertake the conversion of the Greenland colony. Leif accepted the mission with some reluctance, for he "thought that this errand would be hard to carry through in Greenland." The king found "a priest and other learned men" who were willing to undertake the long journey, and Leif set sail for the west.[4]

In Old Norse life matters of religion were an important activity of the organized state, and the question whether to adopt a new faith must in some way or other have come before the

[2] STORM, *Islandske Annaler*; see entries for the year 986.

[3] *Cristne Saga*, cc. 1, 2 (*Origines Icelandicae*, i, 376–383); STORM, *Islandske Annaler, anno*, 981.

[4] *Olaf Trygvesson's Saga*, c. 103 (*Codex Frisianus*, 157).

Althing, or folk-moot, which was the governing authority in the republic, though of such popular action there is no record. But the Saga tells us that Leif's mission was quite successful.

> Eric did not take it at all eagerly, that he should put away his own way of faith, but Theodhild [his wife] accepted it at once, and had a church built not very near the house. This church was called Theodhild's church. She used to hold her prayers there with such folk as took upon them Christendom, and they were many. Theodhild would not live with Eric after she had taken the faith and this grieved him very much.[5]

II

The physical conditions in the colony were such that only with the greatest difficulty could the Church maintain a normal existence. The settlements were founded on a narrow strip of land along the upper stretches of the fjords, where there was shelter from the keen winds that blew in from the southwest. Here the soil thaws out in the summer and grass grows quite abundantly. But a few miles back are hills and mountains covered with everlasting ice. Under such conditions agriculture was impossible, and practically every form of vegetable food had to be brought from afar; all the metals that are needed in civilized life also had to be imported from Europe.

The merchants who visited Greenland usually came from Norway; but an occasional ship also came from Iceland, and the merchants of England are likewise known to have traded in Greenland.[6] But such communication as there was with the outer world was often quite irregular; years might pass without the visit of a single ship. In 1308 Bishop Arne of Bergen sent a letter to the bishop of Greenland in which he reported as recent news the death of King Eric, who had passed away nine years earlier.[7]

The population of Greenland in the Middle Ages can scarcely have counted more than 3,000 inhabitants at any time. In an old description of the country the West Settlement is credited with 90 homesteads and the East Settlement with 190.[8] The churches were relatively numerous: twelve in the larger settle-

---

[5] *The Saga of Thorfinn Carlsemne*, c. 2 (*Origines Islandicae*), ii, 615.

[6] *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, iii, 160 *ff.*

[7] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, x, 14-15.

[8] *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, iii, 226–229 (*Grönlandiae vetus Chorographia*).

ment and four in the smaller.[9] The parishes were necessarily small, as the absence of roads and the severity of the weather in winter would not permit long journeys to church.

Ivar Bardsson, who went to Greenland in 1341 or the following year and for a number of years was steward at the Cathedral church,[10] reports that in his day there were two monastic establishments in the colony: "a great monastery dwelt in by regular canons,"and "a cloister of nuns of Saint Benedict's Order."[11] These were located in the southern part of the East Settlement, some distance from the center of colonial life.

The monastery was consecrated to Saint Olaf and Saint Augustine. That Saint Olaf, the foremost of the Norwegian saints, should hold the first place in the hearts of the Greenlanders was only natural. It was also to be expected that Saint Nicholas, the patron saint of the seafaring man, should be generally popular on the perilous shores of the Arctic; the cathedral at Gardar was dedicated to Saint Nicholas.[12] Another very popular saint was Saint Thorlak, an Icelandic bishop (1178–1193) whose worship dates from an act by the popular assembly of Iceland in 1199.[13]

Our knowledge of the economic life of Old Greenland is derived largely from a systematic study of material remains. A considerable number of ruins have been explored including the sites of several churches. It appears that the church buildings were nearly all comparatively small, from 23 to 30 feet wide and from 50 to 60 feet long, measured on the outside. As the walls were usually at least 4 feet thick, the room inside was often quite limited. The plan was always rectangular and there was usually no projecting choir. The walls were built of red sandstone, turf, and clay; in one case only (Kakortok) do the ruins show any trace of mortar. The roof was made of wood. The windows were

---

[9] The lists vary somewhat. See *Flateyarbok*, iii, 454; *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, iii, 224 (*Gripla*); *Meddelelser om Grönland*, xx, 319–320 (Finnur Jónsson).

[10] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, v, 122; DeCosta, *Sailing Directions of Henry Hudson*, 95.

[11] DeCosta, *Sailing Directions of Henry Hudson*, 92.

[12] *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, iii, 224 (*Gripla*).

[13] *Ibid.*, ii, 773.

placed in the roof, but the church at Kakortok is the only one that is known to have had glazed windows.[14]

It has long been known that the colony was organized as a diocese with the cathedral at Gardar, a place that has only recently been identified. Gardar was located on the south side of a low, narrow isthmus in the Igaliko region, near an inlet anciently known as Einarsfirth. The soil here is relatively fertile, and the large number of ruins would indicate that this region was the real center of the East Settlement. The walls of the church at Gardar have been traced and show that it was built on the plan of a cross; it seems to have been the only cruciform church in Greenland. Its total length, measured on the inside, was about 74 feet. The nave was 26 feet wide and the choir somewhat narrower. The transepts, extending only 4 feet beyond the walls of the nave, were quite small. There was no projecting apse.[15]

Wood for the necessary church furniture ordinarily had to be imported from Norway. There are occasional groves of birch in Greenland, but few of the trees measure more than a few inches in diameter. A great deal of driftwood finds its way from northern Siberia across the Arctic and southward through Smith Sound; but this would not always prove serviceable for church purposes.[16] It is told that the men who sailed to Vinland loaded their frail ships with grapes and wood for the return voyage.[17] Another possible source of supplies was Markland (evidently the southeastern part of Labrador),[18] where the timber is very plentiful.[19] The churchyards also testify to the poverty of suitable lumber: in a few cases only have traces of coffins been found; ordinarily the Greenlanders buried their dead under large, flat stones.[20]

Greater still was the dearth of iron. Except in a few cases,

---

[14] *Meddelelser om Grönland*, vi, 75 *ff.*(Holm); xvi, 293 *ff.* (Brun).

[15] *Meddelelser om Grönland*, xvi, 324–330 (Brun).

[16] *Meddelelser om Grönland*, xvi, 198 (Brun); xlviii, 6 (Björnbo).

[17] *The Saga of Eric the Red*, cc. 2–3 (*Origines Islandicae*, ii, 601–603).

[18] Fossum, *The Norse Discovery of America*, 40-41, 64.

[19] Storm, *Islandske Annaler, anno* 1347 (Skalholt Annals). "In that year came a ship from Greenland to Iceland; it was of smaller size than the Icelandic ships. . . . It had fared to Markland, but had been driven hither by storms."

[20] *Meddelelser om Grönland*, vi, 75 *ff.*, 119.

such coffins as have been found seem to show that they were made with wooden nails. In 1189, a ship came from Greenland to Iceland "which was nailed together with wooden nails."[21] Church bells were probably not common; fragments of a bell have been found in the ruins of the cathedral at Gardar [22] but it is not known whether any other church was provided with a bell.

Cloth of a character suitable for use in the ceremonials of the Church was difficult to obtain. The Greenlanders kept sheep (and also goats) in considerable numbers,[23] but it is unlikely that the cloth woven in those regions could serve the purposes of the Church. Remnants of brown woolen cloth have been found in certain cemeteries, but ordinarily the Greenlanders appear to have buried their dead without shrouds or any other covering.[24]

The supply of cloth, like almost everything else that had to be imported by the colonists, came chiefly from Norway. In 1308, Bishop Arne of Bergen sent four costly outer garments to Bishop Thored in Greenland: "a 'skingr,' a surcoat, and a cowl dyed blue, all lined with gray fur; also a mantle of the same sort of cloth."[25] In 1347 King Magnus and Queen Blanche drew up a will in which they remembered the cathedral in Greenland with one hundred marks (a handsome sum in those days) to be used for the purchase of "costly vestments."[26]

The greatest problem of the church authorities in Greenland seems to have been how to secure the materials necessary for sacramental purposes: oil for the chrism and bread and wine for the Eucharist. Grain does not grow in Greenland. "And yet there are men among those who are counted the wealthiest and most prominent who have tried to sow grain as an experiment; but the great majority in that country do not know what bread is, having never seen it."[27] The foregoing statement from *The*

[21] STORM, *Islandske Annaler, anno* 1189 (*Annales regii*).

[22] *Meddelelser om Grönland,* xx, 289-290.

[23] LARSON, *The King's Mirror,* 145.

[24] *Meddelelser om Grönland,* vi, 75 *ff.*

[25] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum,* x, 14-15.

[26] *Ibid.,* v. 151. Evil days came to the kingdom in the reign of King Magnus, and doubt has been expressed as to whether the cathedral ever did derive profit from the royal will. *Grönlands Historiske Mindesmærker,* iii, 116.

[27] LARSON, *The King's Mirror,* 142.

King's Mirror suggests the mode of life in the thirteenth century; striking confirmation of this appears in a papal bull from near the close of the fifteenth century in which it is told that the inhabitants of Greenland "are accustomed to live upon dried fish and milk for the reason that bread, wine and oil are scarce."[28]

Grain for bread could be obtained in Norway, where all the hardier species are quite generally cultivated; in certain favored localities even wheat is grown with some success. But often years would pass without a cargo of any sort from abroad reaching Greenland, and one can readily see that the priests cannot have been able to celebrate the Mass so regularly or so frequently as the Church requires. In 1237, when Bishop Nicholas was preparing to depart for his new field of work on the edge of the Arctic, Pope Gregory IX prepared a reply to a very significant question that had come to him from the archbishop of Nidaros (Trondhjem). The archbishop had stated that in some of the dioceses of his province there was great dearth of wheat and had asked whether a wafer made of other materials might be given to the worshippers instead, to which the Pope replied in the negative.[29]

The archbishop had also stated that there was lack of wine in those churches, "for rarely or never is any wine to be obtained in those parts," and had inquired whether beer or some other drink might be substituted; but to this the Pope would not assent. He did suggest, however, that the consecrated bread alone might be given to the congregation, "as the custom is in certain parts."[30]

It seems evident that the church in Greenland also suffered from a lack of priests and other church officials, at least in the first century of its history. The clergy was recruited from Iceland and Norway; that the colony had any facilities for the education of a local priesthood is quite unlikely. Adam, the chronicler of Bremen, tells us that in 1054 envoys came to Bremen from Iceland, Greenland, and the Orkneys requesting that priests be

[28] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, xvii, 644; *Catholic Historical Review*, iii, 226; OLSON and BOURNE, *The Northmen, Columbus and Cabot*, 73.

[29] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, i, 14.

[30] *Ibid.* ". . . quamquam dari possit populo panis simpliciter benedictus, prout in quibusdam partibus fieri consuevit." See also *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, ii, 766–767.

sent to those lands.[31] This lack of ordained pastors is also reflected in the burial customs of earlier times as described in one of the Vinland sagas.

> This custom had been in Greenland since Christianity came out thither that men were buried there at the homesteads when they died in unconsecrated earth. They used to set a pole up from their breast, and afterward, when clerks came there, then they would pull up the pole and pour in holy water, and hold the chant over it, though it were a long time afterward.[32]

Though the poverty and hardships of life in Old Greenland must have been very great and very real, the colony also had certain sources of abundant wealth.

> It is reported that the pasturage is good and that there are large and fine farms in Greenland. The farmers raise cattle and sheep in large numbers and make butter and cheese in great quantities. The people subsist chiefly on these foods and on beef; but they also eat the flesh of various kinds of game, such as reindeer, whales, seals and bears.[33]

The churches derived their income from these sources, especially from the riches of the sea. Ivar Bardsson tells of a bay where "there were many whales and much hunting for them," of an island where white bears were plentiful, and of another island where many reindeer resorted in the autumn; but there could be neither hunting nor fishing in these places without the bishop's consent, for the fishing and the hunting rights belonged to the cathedral church. The cathedral also derived revenue from certain hot springs which were believed to have medicinal virtues and from a "forest" in which cattle were pastured.[34] The endowments of the other churches appear to have been of a similar character.

In 1274, the Council of Lyons decreed that for a period of six years the clergy should contribute a tithe to be used for the promotion of the cause of Christendom in the Holy Land. The precious metals were scarce in Norway and even more so in the Norwegian colonies, and the archbishop, to whom the collection of the tithe had been entrusted, was reluctant to undertake the

---

[31] Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammenburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum*, iii, c. 23.
[32] *Saga of Thorfinn Carlsemne*, c. 3 (*Origines Islandicae*, ii, 617).
[33] Larson, *The King's Mirror*, 145.
[34] DeCosta, *Sailing Directions of Henry Hudson*, 90–93.

task.[35] He reported "that the only tithes that can be gathered in Greenland are composed of skins of cattle and seals, tusks, and ropes of whales [walrus hide] which . . . cannot be sold for any fair price."[36] The Pope replied that the tithes should be collected and the materials exchanged in the best way possible for gold or silver, which was presumably done.

In 1327 the clergy of Greenland contributed to a second sexennial tithe, the payment this time taking the form of walrus tusks. The collector, Bertrand de Ortolis, received in all 127 *lisponsos*[37] of this commodity, which he sold to a Flemish merchant for 12 pounds and 14 sous Tournois, a considerable sum for a diocese with a population so small as that of Gardar. The collector also accounts for three *lisponsos* of walrus tusks received at the same time in payment of the Peter's pence.[38]

There seems to be no record of any subsequent payment to the papal treasury. In 1345 Archbishop Paul and his suffragans, in apportioning a tithe due at that time among the various dioceses of the province, definitely excused the Faroes and Gardar from sharing in the payment.[39] In 1402 Boniface IX directed Bishop Jacob of Bergen to collect revenues for the Holy See in several dioceses including Gardar;[40] but as all communication with Greenland ceased a few years later, it is not likely that the clergy of Gardar made any contributions in the fifteenth century.

III

For more than a century the new Church in Greenland was without episcopal supervision. It may be that during this period the colony enjoyed an occasional visit from an alien bishop, as

[35] *Catholic Historical Review*, iii, 217 *ff.*; Munch, *Pavelige Nuntiers Regnskabs og Dagböger*, 139 *ff.*

[36] *Catholic Historical Review*, iii, 222 (translation slightly corrected). The ropes of walrus hide are mentioned in *The King's Mirror*, 140, 142.

[37] The Norwegian *lispund* is usually translated "stone"; it should probably be reckoned at 12 pounds.

[38] Munch, *Pavelige Nuntiers Regnskabs og Dagböger*, 25, 28. Dr. Jelić has attempted to show on the basis of the Peter's pence of 1327 that Greenland had a population of at least 10,000. (*L'évangélisation de l'Amèrique avant Christophe Colomb*). The errors in Jelić's calculation are discussed by Storm in *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 3. Række, ii, 396–397.

[39] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, iv, 239.

[40] *Ibid.*, vi, 396 *ff.*

was the case in Iceland, where at least six bishops officiated at intervals before the island received its own episcopal organization. It is also possible that after 1056, when Islaf was consecrated bishop of Skalholt (Iceland), Greenland was regarded as officially or unofficially joined to the new diocese; but this is conjecture merely.

During the eleventh century the Scandinavian lands continued a part of the great province of Bremen. But the relations between the Saxon archbishops and the Northern kings were not always cordial, and the Pope was finally induced to permit the establishment of a new province with the Danish (now Swedish) city of Lund as the metropolitan see (1104).

The new archbishop proceeded at once with the organization of new dioceses in the Norwegian colonies. A new bishopric was established in northern Iceland (Holar) in 1106. The Faroes were organized as a diocese about the same date. It seems likely that the churches in Greenland received their first resident bishop early in the following decade, perhaps in 1112.

We read in one of the Icelandic annals that in 1112 "Eric the bishop" went on a journey, presumably to Greenland.[41] It is stated again that in 1121 "Eric, bishop of Greenland, went to seek Vinland."[42] Eric is also mentioned in the "Book of Settlements" as bishop of the Greenlanders.[43] There has been some dispute as to whether he was actual bishop in Greenland: Finnur Jónsson holds that he was probably a missionary bishop[44] like Frederic the Saxon who had labored in Iceland in the tenth century. But it must be remembered that Greenland was no longer a field for missionary effort, having accepted the Christian faith three generations before.

Bishop Eric evidently did not return from his voyage, for two years later the Greenlanders took steps to secure a new bishop. On the motion of Socke Thoresson, the leading man in the colony, the all-moot sent Einar Sockesson to Norway to request a bishop at King Sigurd's court. "Einar had with him much tusk-ivory and walrus-hide to help himself forward with

[41] Storm, *Islandske Annaler*, 251.
[42] *Ibid.*, anno 1121.
[43] C. 6 (*Origines Islandicae*, i, 30).
[44] *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 5. Række, i, 119.

the chief people." For King Sigurd he brought a bear, evidently a white bear, and the king was pleased with the present.

King Sigurd found Einar's request quite reasonable and asked Arnold, one of the clerks at the royal court, "to take up this task for God's sake and his prayers." Arnold accepted the appointment with great reluctance: Greenland was far distant and the people there were hard to manage. He proceeded to Lund, however, where he was consecrated by Archbishop Asser (1124), and two years later he took up the work in the new field where he labored for twenty-four years.[45]

Bishop Arnold seems to have been a typical medieval prelate, humble and devout in his private life, but zealous and unbending in all matters touching what he regarded as the rights of his office and his diocese. He established his see at Gardar,[46] one of the best farms in the colony, which was also the meeting place of the all-moot. Bishop Arnold resigned his see in 1150, and apparently returned to Norway. Two years later he was appointed bishop of the new Norwegian see of Hamar.[47]

Arnold's successor was John Knut, concerning whom almost nothing of importance is known. He was consecrated in 1150 and governed his diocese till his death in 1187.[48] In 1152 Nicholas Brakspeare, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, came to Norway on a legatine mission with instructions to create a new Norwegian province with Nidaros as the metropolitan see. The diocese of Gardar became one of the suffragan sees of the new archbishopric. Consequently Bishop John's successor, another John (also called "Smirill"), was consecrated (and also appointed, it seems) by Archbishop Eystein (1188). He had probably at one time served as clerk at the royal court, though his by-name "Sverresfostre" might indicate that he had been brought up in King Sverre's family.

Bishop John II sailed for Greenland in 1189 but was forced

---

[45] The story of Arnold's appointment and consecration is told in *The Tale of the Greenlanders* (*Origines Islandicae*, ii, 748 *ff*).

[46] Ivar Bardsson speaks of a church at Stensness in the West Settlement, "where in former times was the bishop's seat," but there is no mention of this in any other source. DeCosta, *Sailing Directions of Henry Hudson*, 95.

[47] Storm, *Islandske Annaler*, anno 1152.

[48] Storm, *Islandske Annaler*, anno 1187.

to winter in Iceland, and did not reach Gardar before 1190.[49] In 1202 he set out on a long journey to Norway and Rome. He spent the winter in Iceland, and on Shear-Thursday, April 3, 1203, we are told that he assisted Bishop Paul at the consecration of "a great quantity of chrism."[50] He died in 1209.

The news of Bishop John's death can scarcely have reached Norway before 1210. His successor, Bishop Helgi, apparently sailed from Norway in 1211, for an entry in the Icelandic Annals appears to indicate that he spent the following winter at Flat-isle.[51] The new prelate was the son of a Norwegian merchant who, it is believed, had important connections in Greenland.[52] He arrived at Gardar in 1212 and administered the see for eighteen years.

The next in the order of succession was Nicholas, who was consecrated in 1234. The delay in filling the vacancy was probably due to the fact that the metropolitan office had become vacant in the year of Bishop Helgi's death. The new Archbishop, Sigurd, was consecrated in 1231 but did not return from the customary journey to Rome before the next year. The annalists have almost nothing to say about Bishop Nicholas. The year of his death is uncertain; it is variously given as 1240, 1241, and 1242.

For nearly three hundred years Greenland was a republic. Every year toward the close of July the important men of the two settlements gathered in the all-moot at Gardar to discuss and determine colonial affairs. Except for a brief period early in the tenth century, when some shadowy form of dependence on the Norwegian crown seems to have been recognized, Greenland was absolutely independent. But in the thirteenth century the political freedom of the colony was surrendered. Cardinal William of Sabina, who came to Norway in 1247 to crown the great King Hakon, when asked concerning the right of the Norwegian crown to Iceland gave a formal opinion that it was "unfair that that land should not be subject to some king like all others in the world."[53] This form of reasoning would also apply in the case of Greenland.

[49] According to Alexander VI's bull (cited above) August was the only month in which the coast of Greenland could be approached with safety.

[50] *Póls Saga*, c. 7 (*Origines Islandicae*, i, 515).

[51] STORM, *Islandske Annaler*, 23 ,63.

[52] *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, ii, 757.

[53] *Hakon's Saga*, c. 257.

The desires of King Hakon were doubtless taken into account in the selection of a new pastor for the diocese of Gardar. Bishop Olaf, who had been consecrated the year before, sailed in the summer of 1247 with explicit instructions to secure the submission of the Greenlanders to the Norwegian crown.[54] He was not immediately successful, however, for the all-moot did not acknowledge the sovereignty of King Hakon before 1261.[55]

The following year Bishop Olaf sailed for Norway, perhaps to report on the success of his diplomatic mission. But his ship was wrecked on the coast of Iceland and he was forced to remain on that island for two years He finally arrived in Norway in 1264. After an absence of nine years he returned to his diocese,[56] where he died in 1280.

For eight years the See of Gardar remained vacant. This may have been due to a bitter strife raging at the time between the archbishop and his chapter concerning the right to select bishops for the Norwegian dependencies. The king was finally called in to mediate, and in 1296 it was agreed that the archbishop should select the candidates with the advice and consent of the chapter, the rule to apply to the sees in Iceland, Greenland, the Faroes, and the Hebrides, but apparently not to the Orkneys.[57]

Bishop Thored, who had been consecrated in 1288, served his diocese actively for twenty years. He returned to Norway in 1309 where he remained till his death five years later.[58]

Thored's successor, Bishop Arne, was consecrated the same year (1314) and remained in charge of the churches of Gardar for thirty-two years. During his episcopate communication between Norway and Greenland came to be very irregular. Acting on an unfounded report, the authorities at Nidaros in 1343 consecrated John Skalli bishop of Gardar, for "Archbishop Paul did not know that Arne was still living."[59]

John Skalli never visited Greenland and cannot, therefore, be counted among those who actually administered the See of

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] *Ibid.*, c. 311.

[56] STORM, *Islandske Annaler, anno* 1271.

[57] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, iii, 44*ff.*

[58] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, vii, 62, 68; ix, 104; STORM, *Islandske Annaler, anno* 1314.

[59] STORM, *Islandske Annaler*, 273-274.

Gardar. After a few years he received a diocese in Iceland, of which he came into possession only after a long conflict with the local clergy.

Meanwhile Bishop Arne died (in 1349), and for nineteen years the colony was without a bishop.[60] This long vacancy was doubtless due to the demoralized condition of the Norwegian church after the Black Death, which swept over northern Europe in the year of Bishop Arne's death. "Of this pestilence died Archbishop Arne and all the canons in Nidaros except one whose name was Lodin; and he held an election and chose Olaf, the abbot of Holm, to be archbishop."[61] It was during this vacancy that Ivar Bardsson, who has been referred to above as steward at one time of the cathedral property at Gardar, lived in Greenland. Ivar was a young Norwegian priest who went out to the colony in 1341 (or 1342) on business for the Church in Bergen.[62]

In 1365 Brother Alf, a cleric residing in Bergen, was consecrated Bishop of Gardar. Three years later he took up his duties in the little northern see and apparently served his parishioners continuously for nine years. The year following his consecration we find that he transferred to Saint Michael's Monastery in Bergen certain plots of ground near this monastery on which he had built houses with his own money and with assistance from the cloister.[63] It seems possible to infer from this that he had been a man of affairs who had entered the clerical profession somewhat late in life.

Brother Alf was the last Bishop of Gardar who actually resided in his diocese. He laid down the crozier in 1377, but the news of his death did not reach Norway before 1383. Henry, later bishop in the Orkneys, was appointed to succeed him, but he never visited Greenland. Meanwhile the see was apparently administered by a bishop's official; such an *officialis* testified to the legality of a marriage in 1409.[64] When Björn the Jerusalemfarer was in Greenland in the decade following Bishop Alf's

---

[60] Storm, *Islandske Annaler, anno* 1368 (p. 228).

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 276.

[62] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, v, 122; *cf.* Munch, *Det norske Folks Historie, Unionsperioden*, i, 314–315.

[63] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, xii, 80.

[64] *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, iii, 148.

death, "an old priest held the episcopal seat and performed all manner of episcopal duties."[65]

IV

During the fourteenth century the sailings between Norway and Greenland became constantly more infrequent and irregular. The annals record that a ship came from the colony in 1410, but after that date there is silence. Left wholly to their own resources the old settlements were doomed, for civilized life could be maintained only through communication with Europe.

How and when the colony finally disappeared cannot be known, but there is some evidence that it still existed at the close of the fifteenth century. This evidence is found in a papal letter already referred to, in which the Pope excuses Bishop Matthias and the Church of Gardar from the payment of certain dues to the Roman chancery. In this document Pope Alexander states "that no vessel has touched there [Greenland] during the past eighty years." He also has been informed, he tells us, that "no memory of the Christian religion is found except a corporal, which is shown to the people once a year, and on which, it is said, the last priest who officiated there consecrated the body of Christ a hundred years ago."[66] So closely does this information and other facts recorded in the letter agree with what can be learned from other sources that scholars are inclined to believe that news may have come from the settlements in the Arctic shortly before 1492.[67]

The decline of the colony in Greenland began with the submission of 1261. It was not long before the Norwegian king stretched forth his hand to seize the trade of the Arctic. In the fourteenth century the king's officials alone had access to the wares of Greenland. Merchants who traded on their own account were forbidden even to approach the shore.[68]

There is some reason to believe that in the fourteenth century

---

[65] *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, iii, 435 *ff.*

[66] Olson and Bourne, *The Northmen, Columbus, and Cabot*, 73–74; *The Catholic Historical Review*, iii, 225–226; *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, xvii, 644. The letter was probably drawn up in 1492.

[67] *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 3. Række, ii, 401 (Storm); *Meddelelser om Grönland*, xlviii, 13–14 (Björnbo).

[68] *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, iii, 435.

the ice-masses off the shore of the East Settlement increased materially in volume; consequently it became very difficult to make the land and occasionally the royal merchant ship was wrecked. The regularity of communication was further disturbed by the Black Death; after 1349 no ship seems to have sailed to Greenland for six years. The union of the Norwegian and Danish crowns (1380) also had unfortunate results for Greenland: the kings in Copenhagen showed no real interest in the distant dependency except as they insisted on their commercial monopoly.

In 1266 the sources first make mention of a native population, the *Skrælings*, who occupied the coast some distance north of the West Settlement.[69] There is no indication that the Greenlanders tried to convert their Eskimo neighbors; on the contrary, if we can trust a late transcription of a document that has since disappeared, some of the Greenlanders renounced the faith and joined the heathen about 1342. If Ivar Bardsson is correctly reported, the West Settlement was attacked by hostile *Skrælings* a few years later and completely destroyed. It is evident that the colony was hard pressed, for in 1355 King Magnus ordered the royal merchant ship to be fitted out for a voyage to the Arctic to assist in maintaining Christianity.[70] The Icelandic annals report that in 1379 the Eskimos attacked the East Settlement, slew eighteen men, and carried off two boys into captivity. This was two years after Bishop Alf, the last bishop in Greenland, had closed his labors.

. . . . . .

The Diocese of Gardar ceased to be a living reality in the ecclesiastical world soon after the death of Bishop Alf, but for more than a hundred years its ghost continued to haunt the Church in the North. During the period from 1377 to 1530 at least eighteen churchmen seem to have borne the title "Bishop of Gardar," though, so far as we know, with a possible single exception, none of them ever tried to find and visit the diocese that was entrusted to his care. In some cases the honor conferred was frankly titular, but in certain other instances that can scarcely have been true.

[69] *Hauksbók*, 500; *Meddelelser om Grönland*, xxxi, 23 (Thalbitzer).
[70] *Meddelelser om Grönland*, xlviii, 11*ff*.

Shortly before 1377 the Pope reserved the See of Gardar to the Roman curia[71] and the later appointments to this office were made at Rome instead of at Nidaros. The Norwegian archbishops had apparently sought to find candidates whose families had mercantile or other interests in Greenland and who would be willing to brave the perilous sea route around Cape Farewell. The new arrangement was exceedingly unfortunate in that it failed to find men of that character and left the Church in Greenland without normal direction and government. The bishop was the natural leader of the moral forces in the colony; and with episcopal guidance and supervision Old Greenland might have continued to remain within the circle of light.

The following list of bishops who received their appointments to the See of Gardar subsequent to the death of Bishop Alf is added chiefly to complete the record. The list shows a continuous series of appointments except for a possible interruption during the two earlier decades of the sixteenth century. In one or two instances the identity may be in doubt, but in all the other cases the evidence, so far as it goes, is clear and explicit.

Bishop *Henry* appears in the documents for the first time in 1386; he was probably consecrated the year before. In 1391 he was resident and active in the diocese of the Orkneys, to which see he was translated three years later. He died in 1396.[72]

There is a single allusion to a Bishop *George* who died in 1389 or earlier. He was bishop by appointment from Avignon (this was the period of the Great Western Schism).[73]

When Henry was given the See of the Orkneys, Bishop *John* of that diocese was translated to Gardar "for the better utility of both sees."[74]

On the death of Bishop George, *Peter Staras*, a Franciscan friar of unknown nationality, was appointed bishop by Clement VII (Avignon).[75]

In 1401 the Roman curia appointed *Berthold*, probably in

---

[71] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, xvii, 185.

[72] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, iii, 357; iv, 398; xvii, 142, 144, 147–149, 153; STORM, *Islandske Annaler, anno* 1391.

[73] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, xvii, 132.

[74] *Ibid.*, xvii, 147–148.

[75] *Ibid.*, xvii, 132.

succession to John (earlier of the Orkneys). Berthold employed the title "Bishop of Gardar," in extant documents from 1401 to 1426.[76]

In 1402 *Peter*, Bishop of Strengness (Sweden), was released from this diocese and translated to Gardar; six months later he was restored to his former see.[77]

In a document of 1411, John XXIII (Bologna) reported that he had recently heard of the death of *Eskil*, Bishop of Gardar. It is possible that Eskil had been appointed from Avignon in succession to Peter Staras.[78]

The same document notes the appointment of *Jacob Petersson Treppe*, a Danish friar (Franciscan), to succeed Eskil. Later in the same year Bishop Jacob acted for the bishop of Roeskild (Denmark) as "*in spiritualibus generalis vicarius.*" His death is noted in a document of 1425.[79]

Robert Ringman, a Franciscan friar of English nationality, was appointed to the episcopal office in Greenland made vacant by the death of Brother Jacob (1425).[80]

Robert's successor was *Gobelinus Bolant* (or *Volant*), an Augustinian friar and a German, who received his appointment in 1431. The following year he was translated to the Danish see of Börglum [81] Gobelinus had earlier served in Rome as penitentiary.

John Erler de Moys, a Franciscan friar (also a German and former penitentiary), received the see of Gardar in 1432, after Gobelinus had been promoted to Börglum.[82]

The tenure of Bishop John must have been a matter of a few months only, for there are two references to a Bishop *Nicholas* (he is called Michael in one document) who died as Bishop of Gardar in 1433.[83]

Bartholomew de St. Ypolito, a lector of the Dominican Order, was appointed to succeed Bishop Nicholas in 1433.[84] Bishop

---

[76] *Ibid.*, xiii, 52, 70; xvi, 56, 74; xvii, 185–187.
[77] *Ibid.*, xvii, 202.
[78] *Ibid.*, xvii, 257.
[79] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, xvi, 62; xvii, 257, 270, 344, 936 *ff.*
[80] *Ibid.*, xvii, 344–346, 936 *ff.*
[81] *Ibid.*, xvii, 388–389, 948.
[82] *Ibid.*, xvii, 389, 392–393, 948–949.
[83] *Ibid.*, xvii, 403–404.
[84] *Ibid.*, xvii, 403–405.

Bartholomew's nationality is not known, but he was clearly not a North European.

Among the prelates who were present at a church council held in Oslo in 1440 was *Gregory*, Bishop of Gardar. He was also in attendance at a similar meeting held in Bergen ten years later.[85]

Andrew Mus, a Danish ecclesiastic, begins to appear in the documents as Bishop of Gardar about 1466. He had served earlier as *officialis* in Skalholt (Iceland) and was at the time vicar of the see of Linköping (Sweden). The year of his death has not been found, but it was not later than 1483.[86]

Bishop Andrew's successor was *Jacob Blaa*, a Dominican friar (also a Dane), whose appointment dated from 1483. He seems to have borne the title for nearly nine years at the longest, but finally resigned the honor to make room it may be believed, for a candidate who had ambitions to become something more than a titular bishop.[87]

In 1492, Innocent VIII designated *Matthias Knutsson*, a Danish monk of the Benedictine Order, bishop of the churches in Greenland. The appointment was subsequently confirmed by Alexander VI. It was clearly the desire of Bishop Matthias to set out on the long journey to the lost diocese at the earliest opportunity offered, but there is no record that the opportunity ever appeared.[88]

The last Bishop of Gardar was *Vincentius Petersson Kampe*, a Danish cleric attached to the court of Christian II, who received his appointment in 1519. King Christian was planning to send an expedition into the northwestern seas to restore communication with the abandoned colony; and the selection of a bishop was a part of this plan. But the interest of the restless king was soon diverted to other matters, and the project was abandoned.[89]

LAURENCE M. LARSON, Ph.D.,
University of Illinois,
Urbana, Illinois.

---

[85] *Ibid.*, iv, 676; *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, iii, chronology, *annis* 1440, 1442, 1450.

[86] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, xvi, 249; xvii, 606–607; *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker*, iii, 188–190.

[87] *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, xvii, 606–607, 638, 1131.

[88] *Ibid.*, xvii, 638, 643–647, 1131.

[89] *Ibid.*, xvii, 730, 1164–1167.

Bibliographical Note

The materials for the study of the history of Greenland are practically all to be found in the following four great collections, though some of the documents have also been published elsewhere in more convenient forms:

Diplomatarium Norvegicum, edited by Chr. C. A. Lange *et al.* 17 vols. Christiania, 1847–1918.

Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker. 3 vols. Kjöbenhavn, 1838–1845. This work includes virtually all the literary sources and a considerable number of diplomatic documents; it has been edited with much care and is useful for editorial notes as well as for the documentary materials.

Islandske Annaler, edited by Gustav Storm. Christiania, 1888. . . . Icelandic annals to 1578 with occasional notices of matters touching Greenland.

Meddelelser om Grönland. Köbenhavn, 1881–1918. A series of reports covering topographical and archaeological investigations in Greenland. Vols. i, vi, xvi, xx, and xlviii have been found particularly useful for this study.

The following have also been found useful, though in most cases they duplicate materials found in *Grönlands historiske Mindesmærker.* The writer has preferred to use these in his footnote references because the editions are in some cases more recent and in other cases they contain English translations.

Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammenburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum* (Mon. Ger. Hist. Scriptores, vii). Hanover, 1846.

Catholic Historical Review, Washington, D. C. Vol. iii, No. 2, contains the Heywood MSS., a series of documents from the Vatican archives, several of which are important for the history of the Diocese of Gardar.

Codex Frisianus. Christiania, 1871. A collection of kings-sagas.

DeCosta, Rev. B F. *Sailing Directions of Henry Hudson.* Albany, 1869.—Contains a translation of Ivar Bardsson's treatise on the topography of Greenland.

Flateyarbók. 3 vols. Christiania, 1860–1868. A collection of Norwegian kings-sagas and other narratives.

Fossum, Andrew. *The Norse Discovery of America.* Minneapolis, 1918.

Hakon's Saga, translated by G. W. Dasent, London, 1894. (Rolls Series, No. 88.)

Hauksbók. Kjöbenhavn, 1892–1896. A collection of sagas and didactic materials.

Historisk Tidsskrift, Christiania. Published by the Norwegian Historical Society.

The King's Mirror, translated by Laurence M. Larson. New York, 1917.

Munch, P. A. *Det norske Folks Historie.* 6 vols. Christiania, 1852–1863.

Munch, P. A. *Pavelige Nuntiers Regnskabs- og Dagböger.* Christiania, 1864. Accounts of tithes and other dues collected in the North during the years 1282–1334.

Olson, Julius E. and E. G. Bourne. *The Northmen, Columbus and Cabot.* New York, 1906. Contains translations of the Vinland documents.

Origines Islandicae, edited by Gudbrand Vigfusson and F. Y. Powell. Oxford, 1905. A collection of Icelandic narratives with translations.

PAUL DE SAINT PIERRE

THE FIRST GERMAN-AMERICAN PRIEST OF THE WEST

It is not one of the brilliant periods of our Catholic history which this article intends to treat, nor is it one of the Church's great saints or scholars whose footsteps we are about to trace on the rough paths of our early western days. The times were out of joint; a period of transition had set in; the political changes had brought about a sad disorganization of society; and the Church needed men of strong nerves, as well as of strong faith, to uphold her rights and to protect her interests and those of her children unto the dawn of a better day. The scene is the old Illinois Country, once so renowned for its flourishing Indian Missions; the period is the time immediately following our Revolutionary War; and the central figure is the courageous German Carmelite, P. Paul de Saint Pierre, successively pastor of Cahokia, 1785–1789, Ste. Genevieve, 1789–1797, and of St. Gabriel's at Iberville, 1804–1826.

For many years the shadowy figure of a wandering Carmelite monk flitted across the pages of our histories and magazines; we shall endeavor to give him "a local habitation and a name."

The earliest official testimony concerning P. Paul de St. Pierre is found in the Report, which the newly appointed Prefect of the Missions in the United States, Dr. John Carroll, sent to the Prefect of the Propaganda at Rome, Cardinal Antonelli, February 27, 1785:

> As to the Catholics who are in the territory bordering on the river called the Mississippi and in all that region which, following that river, extends to the Atlantic Ocean, and from it extends to the limits of Carolina, Virginia and Pennsylvania—this tract of country contains, I hear, many Catholics, formerly Canadians, who speak French, and I fear that they are destitute of priests. Before I received Your Eminence's letters there went to them a priest, German by birth, but who came last from France; he professes to belong to the Carmelite Order: he was furnished with no sufficient testimonials from his lawful superior. What he is doing and what is the condition of the Church in those parts, I expect soon to learn. The jurisdiction of the Bishop of Quebec formerly extended to some parts of that region; but I do not know whether he wishes to exercise any authority there, now that all these parts are subject to the United States.[1]

[1] J. G. SHEA, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, p. 257. A few months before this document was written, the well-known Father Farmer of Philadelphia gave Father de Saint Pierre a letter of introduction to the Prefect Apostolic of Baltimore, dated October 9, 1784:

"Rev. Sir:—The bearer, being already known to Your Reverence, needs not my

The question arises, who was this German priest, the Carmelite monk, lately arrived from France, and now on his way to the distant, almost unknown western country, the unwitting cause of such mingled feelings of hope and misgiving in Dr. Carroll's breast. There was then a German priest in the West, P. Bernard de Limpach, the first canonical pastor of St. Louis (1776–1789), but he was a Capuchin and came from New Orleans. Msgr. Carroll's "German priest," the Carmelite can be no one else than our P. Paul de St. Pierre. The French designation need not cause the least difficulty. Changing one's name was then of frequent occurrence, even among men of high standing. Some of the most honored German pioneer-priests of the East are known to history, not by their original surnames, but by some American equivalent. Thus Father Ferdinand Farmer, the Vicar-General of Bishop Carroll, had Americanized his name from F. Steinmeyer, Meyer signifying farmer; Father Matthias Manners was originally M. Sittensperger, Sitten being the German for manners; and Prince Gallitzin was known among his parishioners as Father Smith, a matronymic derived from his mother's maiden name, von Schmettau. A missionary among Americans of that day might well find his long German appellation a serious hindrance to his spiritual activities. The case, however, of our German missionary with the French name was somewhat different. He is represented as a member of the Carmelite Order, coming from France, and presumably from some French monastery. Now, whilst it was customary among the Capuchins that the novice should, in addition to the name of his patron saint, be distinguished by the name of his birthplace as, for

---

commendation. When he arrived during the war, he immediately by letter signified to me his desire to be a missionary in these parts. He designed to fix himself at the Illinois. I see no reason why I should not be glad of his zeal, nor why Your Reverence should not grant him necessary faculties, *servatis servandis*. You may be assured that nothing happened this long time so agreeable to me as your appointment to the office of Prefect Apostolic. I will not congratulate with you, but with ourselves, that so seasonable an establishment was made of which I may truly say '*magno me liberasti metu.*' Allow me to express my sentiments. Let us rely on the goodness of Divine Providence and fear nothing. *Commendo me impense in Vestra Sta.*

"Rev. Sir, Your most humble and obedient servant,

"FERDINAND FARMER."

Cf. American Catholic Researches, Vol. xxiii, No. 3.

example, P. Bernard a Limpach, from the village Limpach in Luxembourg—the Carmelites adhered to the practice of adding the name of a secondary patron-saint to the main one, as for instance, the celebrated Peter a Sancto Andrea, Valentinus a Sancto Amando, Sebastianus a Sancto Paulo, and many others clearly show. The designation Paulus a Sancto Petro, in French Paul de Saint Pierre, would then be our Carmelite missionary's title in the Order.

But what was P. Paul de Saint Pierre's original family name? In a bill of complaints presented October 23, 1785, to the ecclesiastical authorities at Baltimore, by John Edgar and Louis Tournier against de Saint Pierre, we find among other charges the following:

> The Minister, who is a German, has changed his name. He is called here St. Pierre, but in true German, Heiligenstein.[2]

If this testimony were founded on fact, as it probably is, then "Paul de Saint Pierre" would be nothing more than a literal translation of the German Paul von Heiligenstein. If, however, we should be inclined to lay stress on the particle *de*, the title de Saint Pierre, von Heiligenstein, might be regarded as a reference to the Father's birthplace, the village Heiligenstein in the Bavarian Palatinate.

But whatever may be the circumstances in the case of the French name of our pioneer priest, the fact remains, beyond a doubt, that P. Paul de Saint Pierre was not a Frenchman, nor a Belgian, nor a Dutchman, but a German.

According to the testimony of Father Gibault, Paul de Saint Pierre was born in the year 1751 in Germany,[3] very probably, as we have already hinted and shall endeavor to prove, in the German Dukedom, Zweibrücken, called, by the French, "Deux-Ponts." It was in France, however, that he entered the Order of the Discalced Carmelites. Here he passed the most peaceful and happy years of his life in the contemplative quiet of the cloister. But the year 1780 brought the turning point, at which his wanderings began. In a Latin letter addressed to the missionary Louis Payet, at Detroit, de Saint Pierre writes under date, Cahokia, February 18, 1787, as follows:

---

[2] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 531.

[3] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 547.

> I know not by what fate I have come hither. I was well off in France. By order of the Most Christian King I traveled to the Thirteen Colonies, where I acted in the capacity of camp chaplain of the French army. After the war the French Minister resident at Philadelphia insisted so much that I come hither, that I was not able to refuse what he asked.[4]

P. Paul de Saint Pierre frequently reverts in his letters to the circumstance that he had served as field chaplain (*Aumônier*) in the French auxiliary army of Rochambeau, and in this claim he is supported by the testimony af Father Gibault and P. Bernard de Limpach. It is true that in the list of the French army and navy chaplains of our Revolutionary war, as published in *Les Combattants de la Guerre Americaine*, 1778–1783, and reproduced in the *American Catholic Historical Researches* (January, 1904), the name de Saint Pierre is not found. But this list is acknowledged to be incomplete, as not a few otherwise well-authenticated and distinguished names of French army and navy chaplains are wanting in it.

We entertain a surmise in this regard, which we would be glad to see confirmed. Among the four regiments that landed in Rhode Island with Rochambeau, the third bore the title, *Régiment de Royal Deux-Ponts* (Zweibrücken). This regiment was raised by the Duke de Deux-Ponts in 1757. It was first called the Regiment Palatinat, belonging to the Prince Palatin Deux-Ponts (the German Dukedom of Pfalz-Zweibrücken), and was, no doubt, composed of the subjects of the duke and of his immediate neighbors. The officers almost exclusively bore distinctly German names, though Frenchified according to the custom of the day: Duke Christian de Deux Ponts, Count de Forbach, Viscount de Deux Ponts, Count de Spaur, Le Baron de Esebeck, De Haden, Le Baron de Schaumburg, de Truchsess, De Schwingsfeld, De Bibra, De Ichtersheim, De Geispitzheim, de Egloffstein, Ruhle de Lilienstein, De Mühlenfels, De Ludwig, De Furstenwerther, Le Baron de Johann, Le Baron de Kalb, Le Baron de Ratsamhausen etc. But where officers and men were German, there, no doubt, the field chaplain was German also. But who was he?[5]

It is stated in a note in the *American Catholic Historical Re-*

---

[4] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. viii, p. 533.

[5] E. S. Balch, *The French in America, During the War of Independence of the United States*, 1777–1783. Philadelphia, 1895, Vol. ii, *passim*.

searches,[6] that there were five chaplains with Rochambeau on his march through Connecticut; the names of four are listed and it is contended that the fifth was de Saint Pierre. But why is de Saint Pierre's name omitted in the list although his presence with the army is accepted as certain?

In the book, *Rochambeau, a Commemoration* (Washington, D. C., 1907), the statement is made that "the exact strength of the Regiment de Deux-Ponts, in numbers is not known, as the muster rolls of the companies are not given."[7] Now, as the muster rolls perished, the names of the soldiers and probably of their chaplain also were forgotten. Hence we may surmise that the long-neglected de Saint Pierre was the chaplain of the German Regiment de Deux Ponts, Zweibrücken, a conclusion that would find further confirmation in the circumstance that the village of Heiligenstein is in the immediate neighborhood of the town of Zweibrücken. These are but surmises, but above all surmise there is the authenticated fact that P. Paul de Saint Pierre, as one of the field chaplains, accompanied the various campaigns of Count de Rochambeau, was present at Yorktown, and received his honorable discharge from the army at the conclusion of peace in 1783. These patriotic activities, however, were not the only, nor the most important, services rendered by Father de Saint Pierre during the dark days of the Revolution. As a member of the officially recognized and universally respected band of Catholic chaplains of the French auxiliary forces, enjoying the freedom of the land and exempt from the vexatious anti-Catholic laws then still obtaining though not generally enforced, de Saint Pierre did his part in breaking the darksome spell that still rested on the youthful church of America. Seeing the dignified, fearless bearing of the French clergy, the native priests began to labor with fresh courage and confidence. In the meantime the evil eye of the populace became accustomed to look with less disfavor on the ceremonies of the Church and the priestly garb of its ministers, until at last Dr. Carroll, following a similar move of the Episcopalians, took courage to accept the episcopal dignity from the hand of Rome.[8]

[6] *American Catholic Historical Researches*, June, 1899.

[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 573.

[8] *Cf.* Msgr. Carroll's Letter to Cardinal Antonelli apud Shea, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, p. 254.

The war was over, and most of the chaplains, Capuchins, Carmelites, Franciscans and a few seculars returned to France with the troops. Of those, however, that remained in the country, P. de Saint Pierre was one of the most zealous and successful, though his name seems to have lain under a cloud of lifelong suspicion. His moral conduct, his purity of faith and earnestness of zeal, his honesty and singleness of purpose were never questioned; the suspicion had reference only to the regularity of his mission and the validity of his spiritual functions.

Father de Saint Pierre never entertained a doubt about this matter, holding, perhaps, that being sent here by the king of France with the consent of the spiritual authorities, he had a right to stay here by request of the king's representative and the presumed consent of his superior, provided he could obtain faculties from the local ecclesiastical powers. But here was the knotty point.

Father Gibault, the Vicar-General of the Bishop of Quebec or the missions of the Illinois Country, wrote from Vincennes, where he was then stationed, to his superior, Bishop Hubert, June 6, 1786:

> A barefooted German Carmelite, thirty-four years old, with his priest's orders, a certificate from the colonel of the regiment in which he served as chaplain until peace was made, and some letters from the grand vicar granting him the privilege of ministering on the banks of the Mississippi, without mention of any place in particular, whose name is Father de St. Pierre, came here a year ago in the name of M. Carroll, bishop-elect of America, from whom came his orders. I did not dare to say anything to him without your orders, and I did not write to you about it sooner, for he kept saying that he was going to return to France by way of New Orleans. However, he is still in Illinois. He seemed to me very zealous, but with a zeal quite unmanageable for these regions without justice.[9]

The ecclesiastical conditions of the territory northwest of the Ohio River were at the time in a state of utter confusion. The Bishop of Quebec, who had, ever since the discovery of the Mississippi, enjoyed the spiritual jurisdiction from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico, was led to fear that he would render himself objectionable to the new republic, if he should continue to exercise his rights and privileges. Msgr. Carroll of Baltimore found that his own jurisdiction in these new acquisitions of the United States remained doubtful until the boundaries of his diocese should be definitely settled by Rome. No

[9] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 547.

doubt, Bishop Carroll held that, as the Mississippi River formed the western limit of the United States, so all the territory east of the great river should and did come under his jurisdiction. Therefore, he permitted, though not without serious misgivings, that P. de Saint Pierre should minister in his name to the utterly forsaken parishes of Kaskaskia . . . and Cahokia. Therefore, he accepted the proffered services of the Sulpician, Father Huet de la Valinière, and appointed him Vicar-General to the Western Missions. But, later on, new doubts arose in his mind; and he wrote to Msgr. Hubert, the Bishop of Quebec, May 5, 1788.

> Encouraged by the favorable recommendations with which M. de la Valinière was supplied by his ecclesiastical superiors in Canada, I very willingly accepted his offer to go to the Illinois and I have named him my Vicar-General there. Since he left, I have received letters written at Post Vincennes by another priest named Gibault, who tells me that for nineteen years he himself has been in that section Vicar-General of the Bishops of Quebec. It is about this, Monsigneur, that I should like to be instructed, and upon which I dare to ask Your Lordship to throw some light; especially since reports have reached me concerning M. Gibault's conduct that are very unfavorable to him.
>
> I learned, some time ago, that Your Lordship was dissatisfied with me because I meddled in the ecclesiastical government of the Illinois. I did so because I believed it was included in my jurisdiction, and I had no idea that Your Lordship extended his pastoral care to those regions. No motive of ambition actuated me; and if you propose to provide for the spiritual needs there, you will save me from great embarrassment and relieve my conscience of a burden which weighs very heavily upon it. In such an event, my only anxiety would be, that the United States would not allow the exercise of power, even of a spiritual nature, to a subject of Great Britain.[10]

Such were the sentiments of the highest spiritual authority in the United States in 1788. The Bishop of Quebec sent the following answer:

> Although I am not at liberty to assent to the dismemberment of this part of my diocese without the consent of my coadjutor and of my clergy, Divine Providence having permitted the Illinois, etc., to fall into the power of the United States, the spiritual charge of which is confided to your care, I urgently beseech you to continue for the present to provide for these missions, as it would be difficult for me to supply them myself without perhaps giving some offense to the British Government.[11]

With the acceptance of this request, Bishop Carroll's authority over the Illinois country east of the Mississippi was sufficiently established, at least for the time being. But P. de Saint Pierre had arrived three years before this date, first at Pottinger's Creek and in Louisville, then in Vincennes and presently in Kaskaskia and Cahokia, where he held the position of pastor at this very time. From Louisville he had written to Dr. Carroll asking for

[10] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 581, *s.*

[11] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 588.

faculties. Dr. Carroll states in one of his letters to Father Gibault as late as January 20, 1790:

> I am also worried in regard to M. de Saint Pierre. He left here without any power to administer the sacraments, for at that time I possessed no right to grant it to him; and since his departure I have been unable to make up my mind to send him that power, because I am in no wise assured that he came to America with the consent of the superiors of the Order or with such approbation as the usages of ecclesiastical discipline require.[12]

Bishop Carroll's main difficulty sprang from an unfortunate misunderstanding. The Decree of the Propaganda appointing Dr. Carroll Superior of the Mission in the thirteen United States of America, dated November 26, 1784, contained the restrictive clause that he was to give faculties to no priest coming into the country, except those sent and approved by the Sacred Congregation. P. Paul de Saint Pierre did not have this approbation, having come here long before that restriction was made; but for the same reason he did not require that approbation, as the letter of Cardinal Antonelli, which accompanied the decree, informs Dr. Carroll that "the faculties which His Holiness communicates to him, the Superior of the Mission, are also communicated to the other priests of the same states, except the administration of Confirmation, which is reserved for him alone." [13]

Msgr. Carroll, in the course of time, also inclined to this view and entertained a more favorable opinion of de Saint Pierre's ecclesiastical status. At least he permitted him to continue his ministry under whatever authority he may have claimed to act, a course that was certainly the most sensible and just one, in view of the immense distance of these missions from the See of Baltimore and the absolute dearth of missionaries in the west. De Saint Pierre's readiness to accept responsibility when matters were so urgent, deserved recognition. The recommendation given to de Saint Pierre by the French minister was a good sign, and, if the worst should come to the worst, no one could blame the authorities at Baltimore if they tolerated something which they could in no wise prevent.

P. de Saint Pierre, as if awaiting the decision of Dr. Carroll, crossed the river from the American to the Spanish side, where Baltimore could claim no jurisdiction, and was there entrusted

[12] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 592.

[13] SHEA, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, pp. 243, 244, 246.

with the spiritual care of the ancient parish of Ste. Genevieve, May 18, 1785. Here he continued till July 10, 1786, as the records of Ste. Genevieve bear witness. But as Kaskaskia became orphaned by the departure of Father Louis Payet, in May of this same year, de Saint Pierre came to the assistance of this parish also, no doubt with the approval and consent of Father Gibault, the representative of the Bishop of Quebec.

Whilst attending Kaskaskia, de Saint Pierre received from Baltimore a notification in regard to the Jubilee conceded by the Sovereign Pontiff to the United States—a recognition of de Saint Pierre's good standing in the Diocese.

It was no pleasant place to live in, the Kaskaskia of 1786. Law and order seem to have vanished from the land. The French authorities were superseded by the Virginians, and they in turn had departed, leaving the poor Creoles to the mercy of marauding Indians and the tyranny of upstart politicians, whose sole endeavor it was to deprive a trustful people of their wealth and honor. Among these was the firm of Edgar and Tournier. For twenty-five years John Edgar held the office of Justice of Common Pleas. "During this time," says Alvord, "he purchased many of the land claims of the French and in the course of years became the richest landowner of the American Bottom."[14]

When de Saint Pierre arrived, the firm was in the first flush of its iniquitous successes. Father de Saint Pierre at once accused them of stealing. Edgar and Tournier sought redress in the court of the magistrate Nicholas Lachance. Father de Saint Pierre refused to obey the summons of Magistrate Lachance, writing his answer on the back of the order:

> I have the honor to declare to you by the present, that you are incompetent to judge ecclesiastical persons, and at the same time I protest a thousand times against your orders, employed very badly. I have already declared, and I will also prove before competent authority, the question against me. As to the rest, I certify once more to have said that the Company of Edgar & Tournier have stolen. Let Mr. Williams make his oath and depart.[15]

The magistrate, Nicholas Caillot Lachance, was a creature of the notorious John Dodge, who had for so long a time bled and trampled under foot the helpless French Creoles of the American Bottom. The mandate of such an usurping officer and faithless

[14] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. ii, Introduction, p. 133.

[15] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 526.

enemy of his own people Father de Saint Pierre would not and could not respect, especially as the fact of stealing was well known, and the magistrate by John Dodge's favor had to give in:

> ". . . It is not in my power," he wrote, "to do more. I advise them to address themselves to the Honorable Congress as also to the bishop, to produce their complaint, that justice may take place where it is due, it not belonging to me, nor am I competent to go further without the express orders of the Honorable Congress . . . [16]

It is plain that the days of John Dodge's rule of might were drawing to a close. With Governor St. Clair the rule of right was soon to return. But it is to the credit of P. de Saint Pierre that he, as the first man of influence, rose in opposition to this lawlessness in the guise of law. The aggrieved John Edgar and Louis Tournier now brought their complaint before the authorities at Baltimore, saying: "We are doubtful whether you have sent us a priest to look after our spiritual interests, as he is more concerned with temporal affairs and acts as a lawyer in this country. He endeavors to ruin us in our commerce, and to take away our credit . . . I do not think, my Lord, after the letters that I have seen, that a pastor ought to meddle with temporal matters."[17] This seems to have been the end of the case of Edgar and Tournier against Paul de Saint Pierre, whom the complainants called Heiligenstein.

Father de Saint Pierre remained pastor of Ste. Genevieve and administrator of the neighboring parish of Kaskaskia until the arrival of the new pastor, Father Guignes, in 1786. Father Gibault, who had been repeatedly asked by the good people of Cahokia to take charge of this forsaken and almost ruined parish and Indian Mission, requested Father de Saint Pierre to undertake the laborious task, sending him at the same time the power of attorney he himself had received from the Superior of the Seminary of Quebec by authority of the Bishop concerning the mission of Cahokia. The last letter of Father de Saint Pierre from Kaskaskia, a Latin Letter to Father Louis Payet at Detroit, is dated, Parochia Immaculatae Conceptionis, die 18 Februarii, A. D., 1786. From this date on to 1789 de Saint Pierre was pastor of the Parish of the Holy Family and the Tamarois Mission at Cahokia, just across the river from the rising city of St. Louis.

[16] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 530.
[17] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i. p. 521.

It is a remarkable coincidence that in these critical years two German priests, P. Bernard de Limpach and P. Paul de Saint Pierre, the one at St. Louis, the other at Cahokia, separated by the great river but united by the bond of a magnanimous friendship, should unfold their blessed missionary activities in spite of all attacks and misunderstandings. Before de Saint Pierre's coming P. Bernard had, at Father Gibault's invitation, attended to the spiritual needs of the church at Cahokia, and Father de Saint Pierre was ready to return the favor in St. Louis if Father Bernard should be called away. On April 25, 1787, P. Bernard of St. Louis writes to his superior in New Orleans:

> The parish of St. Louis is no more than half a league from that of Kahos (Cahokia), which at present has a priest, who was chaplain to the army of the King of France, and therefore it can easier remain for a time without a priest than other parishes farther down in the colony, as, for instance, that of St. Charles, whose subjects, no doubt, are not less dear to God and to the king than those of Illinois.[18]

In those primitive days of pathless forest and boundless prairie the great river appeared more as an avenue of approach than a dividing line, a circumstance that may explain, to a certain extent, the strange wanderings to and fro of our early priests, especially as the population on both sides was really one people of Catholic French.

On the 6th day of June, 1786, Father Gibault sent a message to Quebec concerning the zealous, or rather over-zealous, Carmelite, "with the privilege of ministering on the banks of the Mississippi." On the 17th day of October of the same year, Dr. Carroll's Vicar-General, de La Valinière, writes concerning a meeting he had held with P. Bernard de Limpach and another priest in St. Louis, in which several charges against P. de Saint Pierre had been discussed and proved to be without foundation, and he ordains that the good people of Cahokia give him, as their lawful pastor, all the satisfaction in their power. The letter was

[18] The parish church of St. Charles on the German coast, Cote des Allemands, founded by the German settlers who had been brought over by the notorious financier of France, John Law, for his American dukedom in Arkansas, but who, after the failure of Law's "South Sea Bubble," were transferred to a tract of land along the Mississippi River, about thirty miles long, a few miles above New Orleans. Almost all of these settlers of the German coast were Catholics; the church of St. John the Baptist was their second church, founded in 1772, and its first parish priest was P. Bernard de Limpach, the writer of the letter quoted above.—*American Catholic Historical Researches*, January, 1898.

ordered to be read on Sunday, after the sermon of the parochial Mass, and afterwards affixed to the door of the church.[19] But ere six months had elapsed, a remarkable change had come over de La Valinière's position in regard to the one time "lawful pastor," now only "acting in the capacity of Parson of Cahokia." The change is explained in the document entitled "Letter from M. Huet de La Valinière, Vicar-General in all the districts north of the Ohio, called Belle Rivière, along the Mississippi, Wabash, Miami, etc., to the gentlemen of Cahokia, greeting and blessing in our Lord."

It is not very pleasant reading, this letter of the Vicar-General; and whatever may have been the merits of the case, it should not have been laid before the people for adjudication. To rehearse these charges against one of his priests before a gathering of laymen was sufficiently imprudent; but here to add to each charge the matter-of-fact answers of the accused priest, and to season the whole proceeding with diverse slurs and insinuations was certainly not calculated to win the parishioners to the side of authority.

In this document de La Valinière cites the very letter he had written to de Saint Pierre:

> Father, there are some that say that you have administered the sacraments of marriage in a prohibited season, namely, during Lent. We do not know whether this be true or false. However, as it is some time since you had power to dispense, you have committed two faults: the one in marrying a Catholic with a Protestant woman, the other in marrying them during Lent, on the day of St. Joseph, without mentioning any other dispensation but that of two publications. Moreover, you have given at Ste. Genevieve a dispensation which is void for want of dispensing power.[20]

Now as to the point that de Saint Pierre had at Ste. Genevieve given a dispensation "*ab impedimento consanguinitatis*," which was invalid for want of authority, as de Valinière says, it must be remembered that Ste. Genevieve, being in Spanish Louisiana, was never within the jurisdiction of de La Valinière, but since 1777 in the diocese of Santiago de Cuba, and since 1787 in the newly organized diocese of Havana; consequently that the dispensation may have been granted by the proper authority, though not that of the complainant, and, to say the least, did in nowise concern de La Valinière, but the Spanish ecclesiastical authorities alone.

---

[19] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, pp. 548 and 549.

[20] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 551.

As to the two faults committed in the territory under de La Valinière's jurisdiction, by authority of Baltimore and Quebec, Father de Saint Pierre gives a very comprehensive though not altogether satisfactory answer, in the letter to the representative of the French Creoles at the American Congress, Barthelemi Tardiveau, dated Cahokia, September 17, 1787:

> I have married Mr. Reihl, a Catholic, with Miss Camp, on St. Joseph's Day. He, de La Valinière, finds fault with it, because the latter was a Protestant. But, as I am from a country where Catholics and Protestants live together, as likewise in some provinces of France where I lived, I think I have more knowledge of such marriages. By a Pragmatic Sanction, the German Catholic priests are obliged to marry persons of different religions without making any difficulty. Lewis the XVI has ordained it so in the Diocese of Marseilles and others in the year 1780. Concerning the American States, you know full well, that it raises no difficulty there; on the contrary, the Apostolic Prefect himself has married his niece to a Protestant. He, de La Valinière, made a great bustle because I married them on St. Joseph's Day without making mention in the register of a dispensation from the impediment of prohibited time, namely, the Lenten season. But be pleased to observe the custom of this country and of several others of marrying on that day. Where custom supplies the place of law, there is no need of a dispensation nor of mentioning it in the register. Howbeit, after his arrival, I have continued the functions of parson at Ste. Genevieve, a Spanish parish, until the house which was destined for me here should be repaired. Here I have given a dispensation *ab impedimento consanguinitatis*, to Mr. Pierre Aubuchon and his cousin, Miss Daumur. He pretends that his coming had taken from me the power of dispensing. That, however, cannot extend to the other shore, where he has never had the least power. The marriage, which I have solemnized, was also on St. Joseph's Day, but it was of a girl whose dying father expired the next day, and who had begged of me that he might have the consolation of seeing his daughter married before his death. Even if that gentleman (de La Valinière) had been acknowledged as Grand Vicar, I could not possibly have had recourse to him.[21]

As the Catholics of Cahokia could not be turned against their pastor, de La Valinière proceeded to the ignoble measure of renewing the calumny that de Saint Pierre had never received priestly orders, a charge for which he had once before received an earnest rebuke from P. Bernard of St. Louis, and which he had been obliged to retract. De La Valinière at this time resided at Kaskaskia, and de Saint Pierre at Cahokia, the two places being about thirty miles apart.

Against all these attacks of de La Valinière the parishioners of Cahokia made a quiet, earnest reply:

---

[21] Alvord's translation of this letter has a curious mistake in giving the original "les prêtres catholiques *allemands* with the 'Dutch' Catholic priests." True, it is not Alvord's own mistake, yet a note of explanation should have been added. The Miss Camp of the Marriage case was the daughter of the first Protestant minister that ventured beyond the Mississippi from the States. The name of the groom is usually given as Reilhe. Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, pp. 570–572.

> We have seen and read with a clear and audible voice, in the assembly of the inhabitants of Caho (Cahokia), convened this day, Sunday after the High Mass of this parish, your letter bearing the date of 11th of April, the present month, which is addressed to us and was handed to us by Mr. La Buxiere. We answer the same by declaring to you, all of us with an unanimous voice, that M. de St. Pierre, our Parson, Pastor and Missionary, has all our confidence, and that we have only to praise and applaud him and the spiritual zeal with which he instructs us, as well as our children. It is in vain that you expect to rob us of the confidence we repose in him; his attachment to us and his disinterestedness are known to us. Therefore, sir, dispense with writing us anything more disadvantageous to the conduct of a priest as worthy of respect as M. de St. Pierre, whom we all reverence. As to the marriage which he has solemnised in our parish on St. Joseph's Day, he had lawful reasons to do so. His conduct in the cases which you impute to him in the letter you write to us is irreproachable, and you give us to understand that the hatred which you have conceived against the dignity of our parson is the only motive that actuates you. We are very much affronted at the shocking and insulting expressions you make use of, in your letter, when you say that he has need of our instructions and those of our wives to conduct himself. Such a discourse savours of irony and defamatory libel, and together with the trouble and disunion you have spread in the villages of this shore, since you are here, are sufficient to determine us to declare to you, that we will never receive or consider you as Grand Vicar of the Illinois. . . .[22]

The document is signed by all the heads of families of Cahokia. It furnishes another indication of the uncertainty of ecclesiastical authority in the Illinois country, and no less, to the old Creole dislike for everything American, in Church as well as in State. This circumstance was, no doubt, used as a point of vantage by P. de St. Pierre over the representative of the Bishop of Baltimore, whose most fearful threat against the wayward and disobedient seems to have been an appeal to Congress. Still, the pastor of Cahokia sought to clear his people of the suspicion of rebellious sentiments against Bishop Carroll, whom he calls their lawful superior.

The first great and partly successful undertaking of P. de Saint Pierre at Cahokia was the recovery of the property once held by the Seminary of Quebec for the Tamarois Mission, and for the Parish of the Holy Family, but sold or disposed of by the last Vicar-General under the French regime, Father Forget du Verger. The sales were null and void, as Father Forget had not been authorized by the rightful owners; in fact, Father Forget's conduct in leaving the Illinois country as he did was condemned, by Bishop Briand of Quebec, as "shameful, even criminal."[23]

All that remained to the ancient parish were "four walls of

[22] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, pp. 561 *ss.* The church Records of Prairie de Rocher are frequently disfigured by the interpolation of the designation "schismatique" after De Saint Pierre's signature.

[23] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. xi, p. 559.

a stone house, with ground three hundred feet wide by nine hundred feet long, and also a field three arpents wide with a length the same as the fields belonging to the inhabitants," and even these few remnants of the former mission and seigniory of Cahokia, once containing four leagues square, were in danger of being lost to the parish.[24]

Here Father de Saint Pierre's aggressiveness served him and his people to a good purpose. The story of the proceedings for the recovery of the mission property and the material upbuilding of the parish of the Holy Family is vividly described in a report of the deputies of the people and the trustees of the Parish and Mission of Cahokia to the Gentlemen af the Seminary of Quebec.

> The inhabitants composing the parish of the Holy Family of Cahokia believe that they ought not to leave you in ignorance of the action which M. Jutard, whose residence for some years past has been Montreal, has taken on May 19, 1785, to dispose of the property of this mission. He gave his power of attorney to M. Augustine Dubuque, traveling merchant of Montreal, to have him sell what still remained of the property of this said mission. . . . We made no opposition, since we had no knowledge at the time of the power of attorney, which the superiors of the Chapter, by the authority of the Bishop, had sent to Father Gibault . . . But Father Gibault has made no use of it. This has been communicated to us about the month of April, 1786, by M. de Saint Pierre, the priest serving our mission, after the sale of the property by auction had been made by the sheriff, for M. de Saint Pierre began serving our parish only afterwards, and M. Gibault transmitted to him those powers concerning the mission of Cahokia. We have learned from this power of attorney that all the sales made by Father Forget, Grand Vicar of Monseigneur were null and void, since they had never been authorized by the Chapter, and that you intended, Gentlemen, that all the property of the Mission be under the power of the missionary whom it pleased you to send, and of the inhabitants who compose the said parish, to be maintained and held in perpetuity for the said Mission and Parish . . . Consequently, we have judicially set aside and annulled all the sales made by Father Forget and others who have succeeded him and have annulled the instruments which the attorney of M. Jutard has had made and which concerned the sale by auction . . . We have reëstablished you in the possession of these goods. For the purpose of lodging our pastor we have built a priest's house, which has cost us almost five thousand livres. (We were obliged to do this) because the house had been entirely ruined by the English and American troops who have lodged there.

[24] Four leagues square; the league at three miles, would comprise 144 square miles. This was the extent of the seigniory granted January 22, 1722, by the first Lieutenant of the King of France, Pierre Duguet de Boisbriant to the Seminary of Quebec for the use of the Tamarois Mission. The estate extended from the mouth of the Cahokia River to Fort Chartres, and was given in fee simple. The grant was acknowledged by the American Government. The Commission appointed by Congress for the examination of land titles approved the grant on June 22, 1822. Then came the great wave of immigration; and most of the land claimed by the Seminary was taken up by settlers. In 1882 the Seminary of Quebec made another attempt to recover its own, not for itself, but for the church in southern Illinois. But that is a long story, worthy of treatment in a separate paper. An interesting contribution on this subject may be found in the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. i, No. 4, pp. 408-412.

The defacements and injuries it had suffered during the time it was abandoned were such that there remain standing only the four walls, which could be repaired only with much labor, for they are without a roof-covering, ceiling, flooring, and the chimneys have tumbled down; there are some fences on the land; the orchard has been so devastated that there is left no vestige of it; all the other buildings have been destroyed even to the wells, which have been filled in.

We have decided to build a church of the ruins of this house, for our former wooden church has fallen, and we are obliged to say Mass in a rented house. We have commenced to work on our projected church, which will cost us more than fifteen or sixteen thousand livres. Since the Mission no longer has any slaves or animals of any kind, M. Forget having pocketed and carried away the money which he was able to collect for them, and since the three arpents of land will become a charge against the Mission on account of the expense for fences and maintenance, we consulted with M. de Saint Pierre and decided to rent it; . . . As to the other property, such as slaves, mills and animals, all these have been entirely dispersed and made unusable at the departure of M. Forget, either by sales, the granting of liberty to the slaves, or by donation of the animals, so that none of these things are to be found at the Mission. There are still some families of negroes on the Spanish side, who are of considerable value. They are living either at St. Louis of the Illinois or at New Orleans, and were either given their liberty or were sold by M. Forget without authority. There are some even here in the village of Cahokia. We have made a demand for those living on the Spanish side; but the major commandant of the Illinois district has refused to do anything . . . Before we saw the contents of the power of attorney addressed to M. Gibault, we were uncertain whether the sales by M. Forget were legal or not, and were fearful of taking false steps and of putting ourselves to useless expenses. This power of attorney, which has been sent us, has reassured us and opened our eyes; and we shall work now for the re-establishment of our Mission, as far as it shall be in our power.[35]

Concluding their letter, the people of Cahokia prefer a petition to the ordinary of Quebec:

We cannot too much praise M. de Saint Pierre, our priest and present missionary. He has all capacity, zeal, and charity both for the teaching and instruction of the faithful and for his ecclesiastical duty. We desire to be able to keep him and pray you to be kind enough to agree to it and to influence Monseigneur to agree, so that he is willing to send to him the commands for our mission.

This church of de Saint Pierre, built in part of the materials of the ruined house, is still standing at Cahokia, as a most venerable, though lowly monument of the early days of Faith in the Mississippi Valley.

It will be remembered that, whilst Kaskaskia, with all its surrounding stations, was entrusted to the Jesuit Fathers, the Tamarois Mission and the Parish of the Holy Family at Cahokia were placed in charge of the Fathers of the Foreign Missions of the Seminary of Quebec. At the dissolution of the Society of Jesus, the representative of the Seminary, Father Forget Du Verger, seems to have been possessed with the idea that the prospects of religion were at an end in these parts, and so he

[35] Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 560 *ss.*

quickly sold or scattered what he could of the property of the Mission and returned to France with the exiled band of Jesuits.

The petition of the inhabitants to the Bishop of Quebec had reference to the appointment of a missionary for the Tamarois Indians, who would at the same time act as pastor of the parish. The Bishop's response is not known, yet the request did not seem to be out of harmony with the views of Bishop Hubert, who, October, 1788, declares that the Seminary had "resigned its prerogative of nominating a superior among the Tamarois only in favor of the Bishop of Quebec," a right which seems to have been exercised for the last time when the saintly Father Savigne (Savine) came to Cahokia in 1812.[26]

Father de Saint Pierre remained at Cahokia until September, 1789, as pastor and missionary, and the parish began to revive and flourish under his fostering care.

Good order and decency in all things pertaining to the religious life were always the object of his vigilant care, and he did not hesitate to employ force, even to the extent of calling on the civil power, whenever it seemed necessary. In the minutes of the Court of Cahokia we find a number of instances.

On December 10, 1786, M. de Saint Pierre, the parish priest, presented the petition, requesting the prohibition of giving strong drink to the savages. The Court decreed that "the ordinance passed here to fore shall be published next Sunday and that offenders shall be punished according to said ordinance."

In March of the following year the pastor, de Saint Pierre, required an oath from every member of the Board of Trustees assembled in the presence of the court, that none of them had taken and hidden certain valuable papers entrusted to them by M. Du Buque. All took the oath and were declared free from all suspicion in this regard.

In all the French settlements of the Mississippi Valley, the

[26] It will be remembered that the various tribes of the Illinois Indians, among them the Tamarois, were almost totally exterminated, in consequence of the murder of the great chief Pontiac, in Cahokia, 1769. The sad remnants were fast passing away during the period of de Saint Pierre's incumbency of Cahokia. In Father Savine's day scarcely a soul was left. Father Savine, the last of the Missionaries, sent to the Illinois from Canada, was acting parish priest of St. Louis, at the time Bishop Du Bourg held his solemn entrance in his Pro-cathedral, Jan. 6, 1818. Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. i, p. 588.

so-called *coutumes de Paris* (the customs of Paris) were regarded as the common law of the land, even in what was afterward called Spanish Louisiana. According to these customs the parish priest had a right to the tithes, originally one-tenth part of the harvest, but now, according to Canadian modification, only one twenty-sixth part, or about 4, instead of 10 per cent of the wheat and corn. Besides this, every family in its turn was required to furnish the *pain bénit*,"[27] the blessed bread, of which every one attending the solemn service received a small piece.

This custom of the *pain bénit* was probably introduced by St. Gregory of Tours and prevailed in Canada and several dioceses of France as late as thirty years ago, but seems now to be passing *in desuetudinem* everywhere.

On January 2, 1789, de Saint Pierre entered suit against some inhabitants of Cahokia on account of their refusal to furnish the *pain bénit*. They in turn claimed there was no obligation. The court, however, was impressed by the pastor's arguments, and declared that the obligation held, and ordered these refractory inhabitants to give the blessed bread, each in his turn, on the days of obligation; in default whereof they were to pay ten livres to the church to make up the deficiency.[28]

P. de Saint Pierre was indeed, a valiant defender of the rights of the Church, and as such we shall see him again in his new field of labor beyond the great river, in Ste. Genevieve. Cahokia had, indeed, grown dear to his heart; but he felt, at the same time, that there were other places that offered a far better field for his priestly labors, The Spanish side, with its great possibilities under Catholic rule, seemed to say: Come. And then, there was another reason that weighed heavy in the balance, the spirit of restlessness that had taken possession of his own people.

Although Father Gibault did certainly take a prominent part in effecting the bloodless conquest of the Illinois country by the Americans under Clark, and although the Creole inhabitants considered a ready submission to the new regime not only a matter of necessity, but also of advantage, they did not have

[27] See Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. ii, *passim*.

[28] *Cf.* the interesting article on "Bread, its liturgical use," in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Also the article on *Blessed Bread in Detroit* in *American Catholic Historical Researches*, Vol. xii, p. 176.

a very deep love for the new-comers: nor could it be justly expected of them. Sudden changes in the administration of a country are always bound to bring certain hardships. So it was in the frontier-towns of the American Bottom. The Virginia troops had withdrawn; no authority had been established; disorder and lawlessness was in full sway, Cahokia alone making an exception to this by establishing a court of justice. The Creoles were offended by the overbearing ways and rude manners of many of the adventurers from the East, and in their native candour and honesty found themselves exposed on all sides to fraud, injustice and even violence. In consequence many of the most important Creole families left their old homes for Ste. Genevieve or St. Louis. The government beyond the river was indeed, Spanish; but the people, the laws and customs, and even the officers were French. Besides, the Spanish government was making strong efforts to draw the remnants of the Catholic population to the western shore. Land grants were offered to all new-comers. For this purpose of attracting the people other enticing offers were made to the missionaries of the east side, and they found a ready acceptance.

On May 1, 1787, Father de Saint Pierre had addressed the following petition to Bishop Cirillo, asking for the appointment to some parish on the Spanish side. The original is in French and is preserved in the Catholic Archives of America, Notre Dame, Indiana:

My Lord:

Three years ago, Mr. Cruzat asked you to give me the parish of St. Genevieve, but as he told me, his letters reached you too late, and Rev. Father Louis (Guignes) had obtained the parish.

Knowing that this same parish is vacant since Fall, I ask you humbly for the favor. Already some of my parishioners, for good reasons, have established themselves on your side of the river, and I hope that the others will soon follow them; therefore I beg you to allow me to follow them also.

A new establishment (New Madrid) has been begun a little below the entrance of the Beautiful River. They will need a priest who knows English and German. I offer myself also for this place. You may dispose of me according to your pleasure and good will.

I take the liberty to send you a copy of my papers, legalized by the Commandant of St. Genevieve, to convince you of the falsehoods that have been spread about me, and of which Mr. Cruzat has already informed you.

Finally, I will try to act in such a manner that you will never regret to have granted me the favor which I humbly beg of you.

During my whole life I shall be with profoundest respect, Monsignor, your humble and obedient servant,

PAUL DE ST. PIERRE,
Discalced Carmelite of Germany, Missionary.

Kaokias, May 1, 1787.

This request was now granted by Bishop Cirillo, and Father de Saint Pierre entered upon his duties of pastor of St. Genevieve in 1789. Father Le Dru of Kaskaskia had preceded him in becoming Pastor of St. Louis as successor to P. Bernard de Limpach, and Father Gibault followed soon after, accepting a call to New Madrid in 1792, where he built the first church and dedicated it to St. Isidore.

Ste. Genevieve remained the home of Father de Saint Pierre until February 27, 1797, a period of about seven years.

As a further cause of this change of allegiance the circumstance is given that the Creoles of the American Bottom no longer showed a willingness to render the usual tithes for the support of the Church. Under American rule there was, of course, no law to enforce the payment of the tithes.

On the Spanish side the legal obligation was, indeed, cancelled by decree of April 22, 1787, but the practice was still in force among the people and tolerated by the authorities. This source of income was an important matter to a parish priest, though the proceeds varied according to time and place. Father Gibault in 1769 received from the people of Ste. Genevieve about 300 bushels of wheat and 500 to 600 bushels of corn; P. Bernard, however, reports that the tithes received at St. Louis never amounted to more than $80.00 a year. Yet, important as the tithes were, there was a still more important source of income, granted by the Spanish and denied by the American authorities —a regular salary of $600.00. With this assured income and the usual prequisites, a parish priest under the Spanish regime need not trouble himself about his temporal support.

It was in the month of September, 1789, that Father de Saint Pierre returned to Ste. Genevieve. On the 13th day of September he performed his first official function, the baptism of a child, and he remained as pastor until 1797.

Ste. Genevieve is regarded as the earliest settlement of whites in the present state of Missouri. The "Old Village" was an offshoot of Kaskaskia, and was planted three miles south of the

present city, hard by the river, in what is called the "Grand Champ." The date of its foundation was about 1730. Very early a church was erected there, dedicated to St. Joachim, which was at first attended by visiting Jesuits from Kaskaskia and in 1759 raised to the dignity of a separate parish with a resident priest.

The Jesuit Fathers, Wattrin, J. B. Salveneuve and John Morinie, all of Ste. Genevieve, were the first resident priests in Missouri. After the suppression of the Jesuit Order the saintly Father Sebastian Louis Meurin obtained permission to return to the Illinois country and made his home, though not continuously, in Ste. Genevieve, 1764–1768. Then came Father Gibault, 1768–1773. His successor was the Capuchin Father Hilarius, (the first Monsignor of the West), 1773–1777. On September 27, 1778, the parishioners, in a meeting held under the auspices of the commandant, de Cartabona, and the acting parish priest, P. Bernard de Limpach of St. Louis, decided to remove the church from the river bank to a more secure location on the land of Charles Valle.

Now Father Gibault took charge once more and remained to 1784. In the year 1782, the inhabitants of the Old Village, fearing the encroachments of the river, began *peu à peu*, as Father Dahmen says, to remove their homes three miles northward to the more elevated ground of the present site of Ste. Genevieve. In the year of the "great waters," May 17, 1785, Father de Saint Pierre arrived from Vincennes and remained until his house in Cahokia should be completed (May 18, 1785–July 10, 1786).

Who Father Louis Guignes, his successor, was, we cannot say. Under his administration (1786–1789) the dwelling of a certain M. Roussin in New Ste. Genevieve was bought and fitted up as the "presbytère."

In September, 1789, P. Paul de Saint Pierre arrived here from Cahokia and established his home with a few slaves, who kept house and managed the farm for him. In 1790 the negro woman Fanchonette, whom he had obtained out of the estate of Pierre Langlois at Kaskaskia, was sold by him to Tropez Richard for $275.00; and on his departure from Ste. Genevieve in 1797 two other slaves were sold by him. All this may seem strange to us, yet slavery was then a universal institution in these regions.

Ever since the great flood in 1785, Old Ste. Genevieve, with its church of St. Joachim, declined; its very site rapidly disappearing in the river. For a time, divine service was held in a temporary structure in the new settlement, whilst preparations were under way for the removal or reconstruction of the church.

In 1793, September 7, the Lieutenant Governor, Zenon Trudeau, came to Ste. Genevieve at the request of Father de Saint Pierre and assembled the inhabitants for the purpose of submitting the project of erecting a new church in the place "where they had sought refuge from the flood." The plan was heartily approved by the inhabitants of the new village, Petite Cote, as it was called; but the people of the neighboring village of New Bourbon also asked for the erection of a chapel. The parish meeting decided that both villages, although only three miles apart, should have churches of their own. Messrs. Lachance, Pratte and Bolduc were appointed syndics to apportion the burdens of the building costs according to the financial abilities of the inhabitants, and the same gentlemen were approved as supervisors of the building operations.

It was ordered that the material of the old building should be used, as far as possible, for the new church in Ste. Genevieve.

On August 31, 1794, Zenon Trudeau made definite choice of the spot for placing the church in the new village and gave orders that it be built, pledging the government's share of the costs.[29]

The new church of Ste. Genevieve was a wooden structure, similar to the old church at Cahokia, and remained standing, though for a time disused, until 1831, when it was torn down to make room for other purposes.

From the Memoranda of Benedict Roux, we gather that P. Paul de Saint Pierre on two occasions attended to the spiritual needs of desolate Kaskaskia (May, 1785–June, 1786; and February, 1792–December, 1796). Ste Genevieve, however, remained his home and regular charge.[30]

A number of very interesting reminiscences of the days of Father de Saint Pierre are given in Henry Brackenridge's *Recollections of the West.* Brackenridge had, as a boy, been sent

---

[29] Ste. Genevieve Archives. From a letter of P. de Saint Pierre, we learn that the proposed chapel in New Bourbon had not been started in 1796.

[30] Ste. Genevieve Archives, at Jefferson Memorial, St. Louis.

to Ste. Genevieve for his education at the parish school and had found a new, most pleasant home with the family of Vital Beauvais. It is a graphic account that the grateful author gives of the peaceful, joyous and sincerely religious family life in the days before the coming of the Americans. Madame Beauvais, especially, is a most admirable Catholic woman. She loved the little Brackenridge as if he had been her own; but she could not bear the thought, that he, an unbaptized child, should share the bed with her own children. She therefore had him baptized by Father de Saint Pierre to make her happiness complete.

The little English boy, *le petit anglais*, as they called him, was now admitted to the dignity of an altar-boy, and as such he received a larger portion of the *pain bénit*, the blessed bread, which however, he did not eat, but brought as a choice morsel to his favorite, the baby of the family. Many years afterwards, on a chance visit to Ste. Genevieve, he came just in time to witness the marriage of this early friend of his childhood. Brackenridge also speaks of the many religious festivals and processions, of the Sunday High Mass and Vespers, by which the spiritual life of the people was constantly renewed, and he dwells with deep feeling on the innocent pleasures and simple pastimes of the dreamy village, in the good old days of Father de Saint Pierre.

The curé enjoyed the love and respect of all. Of course, there were exceptions. Even in peaceful Ste. Genevieve there were crooked ways that had to be made straight, and proud wills that had to be broken. The Ste. Genevieve Archives, now in charge of the Missouri Historical Society, preserve a letter of de Saint Pierre, parish priest, to Don Francisco Valle, the Commandant of the district, dated August 8, 1796:

> SIR:
>
> I can no longer hide the sorrow which the conduct of Le Coyteux caused me on the fourth of this month. I met him before the house of Mr. Bolduc. I prayed him to come and see me the following day after Mass. I missed him. Then I sent him a note saying, as a priest, I begged him not to take advantage of my affection and to come to see me, as I wished to speak to him. Here is the answer he made. I waited for him patiently from the fifth until today (the 8th). Owing to his refusal, I call upon you for a judgment and punishment. The person whom the said Louis Coyteux has in his house, pretends throughout the parish that she is his wife and he calls her so. I implore your aid in order that you may, by force, make her leave his house; and in order to put an end to the scandal, forbid her taking up her residence too near that of the said Coyteux. In case he should show resistance, it will be necessary to enforce the law made by our Monarch, December 24th, 1787, which may be found, no doubt, in your record office, or in the archives of St. Louis; for it was made public not long ago.

The decision of the Commandant was given on the 31st. of August, 1796:

> Don François Valle, Captain of Militia and Civil and Military Commandant of the Post of Ste. Genevieve of the Illinois and its dependencies.
>
> Upon the oft repeated petitions made to us by the Sieur de St. Pierre, curé of this parish, asking that a stop be put to the public scandal resulting from the cohabitation of Mr. Louis Coyteux, resident of this post, with an English woman, whom he has had at his home, for a long time, which is contrary to good morals, also to the ordinances of his Majesty,
>
> We, the aforesaid Commandant, do order Mr. Louis Coyteux to eject from his house the said English woman, and that within twenty-four hours after being notified of the order, under penalty of being prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.
>
> Executed at Ste. Genevieve. August 31, 1796, before noon.
>
> (Signed) Fcois Valle.[30]

The vexed question as to the tithes also came up once more in the same year, 1796. How it was settled we cannot say. Here is the letter of P. de Saint Pierre to one of his confreres, probably Father Bernard of St. Louis:

> There is a difficulty between the Sacristan of this parish and a married soldier who keeps his home separately in his own house. The Sacristan asks 39 litres of wheat for the beadle according to the custom of the parish and again as much for himself annually. The soldier refuses to pay. I believe the soldier is obliged to pay since he has his house and family outside military quarters. The beadle told me that the commanding officer holds a different opinion.
>
> I wish to be well informed before I speak to him and I ask you to tell me what is customary in your parish, and if you can, inquire from the Lieutenant Governor himself. If the officers of the regiment who reside in their own houses in the capital are obliged to support public works, I am sure that the soldiers in Illinois or any other garrison should be equally obliged.
>
> Your most obedient servant,
>
> Paul de Saint Pierre.[31]

As Father de Saint Pierre, by his long and faithful service, had firmly established himself in the affection of his people, it was a great shock to them to hear that their good pastor had been recalled. Gone from Ste. Genevieve he certainly was, since December, 1795, and no one knew whither he had gone. All the old rumors, so long asleep, woke up suddenly and set about their ugly business. The ancient story of the conflict with Bishop Carroll and his long-departed Vicar-General, De La Valinière, had taken on a new lease of life. The truth was that Father de Saint Pierre had quietly undertaken a journey to Baltimore in order to settle this very matter for good, as we learn from a letter found in the Archives of the Missouri Historical Society. In accordance with this fact, we find that the name of de Saint Pierre

---

[30] Ste. Genevieve Archives, at Jefferson Memorial, St. Louis.

[31] *American Catholic Historical Researches*, January, 1898, p. 11. A litre is 1.76 pints.

is wanting in the Records of Ste. Genevieve from December 8, 1795, to May 22, 1796. In its stead we find for January and February, 1796, the name of Pierre Joseph Didier, Parish Priest of Saint Charles; in March, Pierre Janin of St. Louis; in April Didier once more, and in May, Jacques Maxwell, the new Vicar-General. On the 27th day of May, 1796, P. de Saint Pierre returned to Ste. Genevieve. The journey to Baltimore had occupied about six months, the time of his absence from the parish. The letter we referred to is addressed to Don François Valle, the Commandant of Ste. Genevieve under date of New Orleans, January 20, 1796:

My Dear Friend:

I must inform you of the atrocious calumnies that are being circulated in regard to me:

1. That the Bishop of Baltimore had forbidden me all sacerdotal functions within his jurisdiction.

2. That I had performed them during an entire year without his orders.

3. That he had finally driven me from the American Illinois and ordered that his parish priests should have all my jurisdictional functions done over again.

I at once asked that I be informed of the authors of these calumnies; but they are being hidden from me, I do not know for what reason. At the same time, I asked permission to be allowed to go in person to see the Bishop of Baltimore on this subject. This permission was given me, with the very highest testimonial regarding my conduct, which, it said, was altogether above reproach during the time that I officiated as parish priest with you, and an appeal to the Bishop was added at the same time, that he pronounce judgement on the above-mentioned charges.

According to these false reports it was believed that I had abandoned my duties as parish priest without having reported to my superiors. In this belief, before my arrival here (in New Orleans), another priest was sent in my place. In conformity with my promises made to the inhabitants I shall not accept any other parish than that of St. Genevieve. I was assured that it would be reserved for me, and that orders would be issued to the aforementioned priest to go farther on.

Upon my return to your town, I, on my part, promised to clear myself, with the high testimonial of the Bishop of Baltimore, of the calumnies made against me and to show the falseness of the alleged articles. This step did not cost me anything, as I had been engaged to take the trip by sea for reasons known to you.

Be kind enough to present my respects to your wife and give my love to all of your family for me. Say to my friends and all the parishioners that I appreciate highly their affection, and that I am absolutely unalterable in the resolutions and promises which I made, of not accepting any other parish than theirs, and that I absent myself from them, only to justify myself against the calumnies of wicked tongues, that I may remain with them for a longer and more peaceful period. Beg them also to cherish, assist and satisfy, in every possible way, the priest who will be sent in my place, and present my respects to him, and say that whatever I have is at his service and at his disposal, so as to make his stay agreeable.

I send the good news that Mr. Delassus has been promoted to fill the place of Mr. Portelles and that he will go to new Bourbon as soon as possible, and from there to Ste. Genevieve.

Mr. François Collell sends you his love and wishes to say that an unforeseen delay has prevented his brother from sending the barge up the river. He took possession of the barge and of all the money which Mr. Bonaventure had in commission on your account, and that of your brother. He will give an

account of it according to your order. This same delay necessitates my remaining here a while longer to render my services.

Monseigneur, the Bishop[32] has ordered, at the bottom of the inventory of the property which the late Mr. Peyroux gave to the church, that Mr. Henri Peyroux should deliver the books, and now it is disputed; the bell has not arrived from Havana. The three hundred dollars the governor does not wish to have delivered until the chapel at New Bourbon is built. This chapel, in my opinion, will do more harm and cause more disorder than the amount is worth; but let the inhabitants decide. The Governor declared against the liberty of Mr. Vital's mulatto woman.

I am to be paid for the funeral services and burial of the widow Peyroux. . . . Do me the kindness to take possession of my corn, in case the king should need it.

While awaiting the happy hour when I shall be able to assure you in person of my unalterable affection, rest assured that my heart is as near as my body is far from you. God give you good health and every kind of prosperity.

I remain, my dear friend,

Your very devoted

DE SAINT PIERRE.

New Orleans,
January 20, 1796.

P. S. I will write to you at the first opportunity from Baltimore or Philadelphia.[33]

But the days of Father de Saint Pierre as Pastor of Ste. Genevieve were already numbered. Father James Maxwell, an Irish priest, who had made his studies at Salamanca, had arrived just before de Saint Pierre's return from Baltimore, in May, 1796. Father Maxwell came as Grand Vicar of the Bishop of Santiago de Cuba and took up his residence in New Bourbon, whilst de Saint Pierre for a time continued his priestly ministrations at Ste. Genevieve. Two priests, in what was practically one parish, could not exist and would not subserve the best interests of religion. Father de Saint Pierre, though not removed, had to leave. The old militant spirit bowed to the acknowledged authority of the new-comer. On the second day of January, 1797, a public auction was held, at which the former pastor's lot of ground with house and barn, and all pertaining thereto, two slaves included, were sold to the highest bidders. The property is described as fronting on the Rue de l'Eglise, and bounded on the one side by the home of John B. Valle, and the homes of Augustin Aubuchon and John B. Lalumandière on the other. The amount realized was 1600 pesetos or dollars, payable either in money, or lead and peltry. The last entry of Father de Saint Pierre in the Baptismal Record of Ste. Genevieve was on February 27, 1797. What his immediate destination was we could not discover; probably the capital of the Province, New Orleans.

[32] Cirillo de Barcelona, Bishop of Tricala and Auxiliary for Spanish Louisiana.
[33] Ste. Genevieve Archives.

Did he retire for a time from active service, or did he perhaps make a visit to the old home across the sea? The monasteries in France were abolished long since. In his native land he was forgotten. America had become his true home. But what was his later course? After the erection of the diocese of New Orleans in 1799, with Msgr. Louis Peñalver y Cárdenas as its first bishop, we catch a glimpse once more of Father de Saint Pierre in Natchez. The historian, John Gilmary Shea, in one of his letters to Chancellor Van der Sanden speaks of a voluminous document in Spanish, preserved in the diocesan Archives of Baltimore; a kind of record of trial under Bishop Peñalver of Father de Saint Pierre for breaches of discipline. The outcome of this trial must not have been unfavorable to the much buffeted missionary.

In any case he was one of the four priests of the twenty-six in all Louisiana, who, according to the statement of the Administrator, Rev. Thomas Hassett, December 23, 1803, "agreed to remain in their respective stations under the French government," and in consequence he received the appointment as Pastor of St. Gabriel's, Iberville, a parish on both sides of the Mississippi, "rather difficult to attend but also very lucrative," as a contemporary writes. Here Father de Saint Pierre labored with great, no longer "unmanageable" zeal and success, and until his death, October 15, 1826, fully twenty-two years.

Father Laval, in his notes transmitted to John Gilmary Shea, praises Father de Saint Pierre as "one of the most remarkable priests that ever administered St. Gabriel's church." "During his time," he says, "the church was removed from its former place on the bank of the Mississippi to where it now stands, the river having swept away the bank in front of it in 1717."

At St. Gabriel's Father de Saint Pierre, the last representative of the old regime, received the visit of Father Francis Cellini, one of the earliest followers of Bishop Du Bourg, who in his letter dated September 30, 1822, styled him "le brave et bon de Saint Pierre." Bishop Rosati never paid the old lion the honor of a visit. The Rev. F. G. Holweck, archivist of the Catholic Historical Society of St. Louis, kindly furnished us with the contents of two letters concerning the last days of P. de Saint Pierre. These letters were written by the Rev. Anthony Blanc, the future archbishop of New Orleans, and are dated Baton

Rouge, September 23 and October 4, 1826. Bishop Rosati was the recipient. Father Blanc informs the bishop that he had administered the last sacraments to the pastor of Iberville. De Saint Pierre, whom he regularly styles, "the Old Man," being in his eighty-first year, could not, in all probability, survive the illness. The parish itself, he added, was in a flourishing condition. The older people attended High Mass and the Sunday Vespers with greatest regularity and devotion. Because the parish had for so many years enjoyed a well-ordered pastoral care, it would be advisable to appoint a successor immediately after the death of de Saint Pierre, or even during his lifetime; in the latter case, the successor might reside at Baton Rouge. The "Old Man" would not have an assistant. The bishop, suggests Father Blanc, might appoint a Lazarist, or Father Michaud, who was *fatigué et dégouté souverainement du service à la paroisse de N. Orleans.* There was another reason for this undignified haste. The "Old Man" himself had provided the necessity for an early appointment. There was a clause in the good Father's last will bequeathing all his property, valued by Father Blanc at about $6,000.00, exclusive of two slaves, furniture, cattle, etc., to his successor. Another clause ordained that "the priest who should officiate at his burial was to be the administrator of his estate, two laymen to assist him." Father Michaud received the appointment immediately after the death of the testator, and Father Anthony Blanc performed the last rites of the church over the remains of his friend and neighbor. P. Paul de Saint Pierre had found rest eternal. *Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum,* his memory still lives as one of the most remarkable men of our early western days.[34]

REV. JOHN ROTHENSTEINER,
St. Louis, Mo.

---

[34] *Bibliographical note:* The author of this very imperfect sketch has used every available source of information on the life and character of P. Paul de Saint Pierre. In regard to the Illinois period, there were numerous letters and documents in the Virginia Series of the Illinois Historical Collections, Vols. i and ii, and the *American Catholic Historical Researches.* The Archives of the Missouri Historical Society furnished a number of unpublished letters, for which the First Vice-President of the Society, Judge Douglas, as well as the learned Archivist, Miss U. Beauregard, have our sincere thanks. The St. Louis Diocesan Archives have added a few notices of the later life of our valiant missionary. Any additional information would be gratefully accepted by the author.

MISCELLANY

QUESTIONS ANENT MOTHER SETON'S CONVERSION[1]

The scope of this paper is not to tell once more the events which led to, and culminated in, Mrs. E. A. Seton's conversion. Her historians, availing themselves of her own *Diary* and Correspondence, and of notes jotted down by her at various times, have done full justice to the subject. But their uniform statements as to the date at which she was received into the Church imply an *impossibility* which must be removed; and their several accounts of her reception are usually worded in terms so vague, or so guarded as to whet, rather than satisfy, the legitimate curiosity of the reader. Our present purpose extends no further than to an investigation of just what took place on this occasion, and the unraveling of the mix-up of dates in which our historians are entangled.

I

First, the question of chronology.

Says Dr. C. I. White:[2]

> Mrs. Seton applied to be admitted into the "one fold under one shepherd." For this purpose, on the 14th of March, Ash-Wednesday, she went to St. Peter's church . . After the service, Mrs. Seton made a formal abjuration of Protestantism, and profession of the Catholic faith.

Mrs. de Barberey writes in like manner:[3]

> Le mercredi des Cendres 14 mars, Elizabeth se rendit à l'église . . . L'office terminé, Elizabeth abjura formellement le protestantisme . . .

Such also is the language of Miss Agnes Sadler:[4]

> The day appointed for this (Mrs. Seton's reception into the Church) was the fourteenth of March . . . it was Ash-Wednesday . . . After Mass, she was called to the sacristy, and there made a formal abjuration.

Rev. B. Randolph, C.M., in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, repeats the same statement:[5]

> The result was that on Ash-Wednesday, 14 March, 1805, she was received into the Church.

In the universal harmony there is, it must be confessed, a seemingly dissonant voice—besides Sister M. A. McCann's, which need not be listened to, as her assertion is evidently erroneous[6]—and this voice is that of Mrs. Seton herself in a letter written April 2, 1805, to Father Cheverus:[7]

> . . . my soul has offered all its hesitations & reluctancies a sacrifice with the blessed Sacrifice of the Altar on the 14th March & the next day was admitted to the true ch: of Jesus Christ . . .

---

[1] The writer—he should perhaps rather style himself compiler—wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Mother Margaret, Visitatrix of the Daughters of Charity and appreciating custodian of Mother Seton's precious manuscripts, to Rev. B. Randolph, C.M., of Germantown, Pa., and to Mr. Thomas F. Meehan of the staff of *America*. To the information readily and bountifully supplied by them is due whatever good is in this paper. Heartfelt thanks to them. The undersigned alone, of course, remains responsible for his conclusions.

[2] *The Life of Mrs. E. A. Seton*. New York: Kenedy, 1904 (10th edition), p. 152. All references to Dr. White's work are to this edition.

[3] *Elizabeth Seton et les Commencements de l'Eglise Catholique aux Etats-Unis*. Paris: Poussielgue, 1906 (6th edition), Vol. i, pp. 316–317.

[4] *Elizabeth Seton. Her Life and Work*. Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co. (4th edition), p. 69.

[5] Art. *Seton, Elizabeth Ann*, Vol. xiii, p. 739.

[6] *The History of Mother Seton's Daughters*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Vol. i, p. 6: "She made her submission to the Catholic Church, at the hands of Rev. Father O'Brien in old St. Peter's Church, Barclay St., March 25, 1805." March 25, 1805, was the day of Mrs. Seton's first Communion; no doubt can be raised on this point.

[7] See WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 156. The text here given is the accurate transcript of the original manuscript of this letter. There is about this sentence a textual difficulty which shall be discussed hereafter (*Cf.* MSGR. SETON, *Memoirs*, etc., Vol. i, p. 218).

This, however, is not the worst difficulty. The main difficulty, indeed, resides in the fact that *March* 14, 1805, *was not Ash Wednesday*. Every one acquainted with the ecclesiastical calendar knows that Ash Wednesday can never be later than March 10, as April 25 is the extreme possible date of Easter. As a matter of fact, in 1805,[8] Ash Wednesday fell on February 27, Easter being that year on April 14. The 14th of March was, therefore, the Thursday after the second Sunday in Lent.

Still, we should not decry superciliously the lack of acumen of our historians. No doubt but that such of them as entered the field at the ninth or the eleventh hour followed in the footprints of those who went before; but these had given their authority, and, to make the confusion worse confounded, this authority was no other than Mrs. Seton herself, who *ought to have known*. The page of Mrs. Seton to which they appealed is from her *Journal to Amabilia Filicchi*. On account of its importance, we must cite here this page, reproducing as exactly as can be done in print the text written by Mrs. Seton's own hand and preserved in the Mother House of the Daughters of Charity at Emmitsburg, Md.; italicizing the words underlined in the manuscript, paragraphing and punctuating carefully as it does, and marking scupulously the pen strokes or lines which now and then separate words or sentences.[9]

March 14th 1805.

A day of days for me Amabilia I have been—where—to the Church of St. Peter with a cross on the top instead of a weathercock——(that is mischieveous) but I mean I have been to what is called here among so many churches *the Catholic church*————

When I turned the corner of the street it is in, here my God I go said I, *heart all to you*—entering it, how that heart died away as it were in silence before the little tabernacle and the great crucifixion over it——ah my God here let me rest said I—and down the head on the bosom and the knees on the bench—if I could have thought of any thing but God there was enough I suppose to have astonished a stranger by the hurrying over one another of this off-scound congregation, but as I came only to visit *His Majesty* I knew not what it meant till afterwards—that it was a day they receive Ashes the beginning of Lent and the drole but most venerable irish priest who seems just come there talked of Death so familiarly that he delighted and revived me.————

after all were gone I was called to the little room next the altar and there professed to believe what the *council of trent* believes and teaches, laughing with my heart to my Saviour, who saw that I knew not what the council of trent believed, only that it believed what the church of God declared to be its belief, and consequently is now *my belief* for as to going a walking any more about what all the different people believe, I cannot, being quite tired out. and I came up light at heart and cool of head the first time these many long months, but not without begging our Lord to wrap my heart deep in that opened side so well described in the beautiful crucifixion, or lock it up in his little tabernacle where I shall now rest forever——Oh Amabilia the endearments of this day with the children and the play of the heart with God while keeping up their little farces with them—Anna suspects—I anticipate her delight when I take her next Sunday——

————So delighted now to prepare for this good confession which bad as I am I would be ready to make on the house top to insure the good *absolution* I hope for after it—and then to set out a new life—a new existence itself.

no great difficulty for me to be ready for it for truly my life has been well called over in bitterness of soul these months of sorrow past.

---

[8] See *Ordo Perpetuus Divini Officii juxta Ritum Breviarii ac Missalis S. Romanae Ecclesiae*, by a Benedictine of the Cong. of St. Maur, Dijon, 1759. The Tables of this *Ordo* cover the years 1758–1900. The initiated will find easily in the *Tabula Paschalis Nova Reformata* of any modern Breviary the date of the principal liturgical feasts of 1805, if they advert to the fact that, for that year, the *Numerus Aureus* is 1, the *Epacta* *, and the *Littera Dominicalis* F.

[9] A collation of the text herein given with that printed in Msgr. R. Seton's *Memoirs*, Vol. i, pp. 213–215, will reveal that the editor of the *Memoirs* took now and then liberties with the original. This ought to warn us that his transcripts bear watching.

———It is done———easy enough—the kindest most respectable confessor is this Mr. O— with the compassion and yet firmness in this work of mercy which I wd. have expected from our Lord himself—our Lord himself I saw alone in him, both in his and my part of this venerable Sacrament—for oh Amabilia—how awful those words of unloosing, after a 30 years bondage—I felt as if my chains fell, as those of St. Peter at the touch of the divine messenger

My God what new scenes for my soul———

ANNUNCIATION day I shall be made one with him who said unless you eat my flesh and drink my blood you can have no part with me———I count the days and hours—yet a few more of hope and expectation and then——— how bright the sun these morning walks of preparation———deep snow, or smooth ice, all to me the same I see nothing but the little bright cross on St. Peter's steeple—the children are wild with their pleasure of going with me in their turn.

Does not Mrs. Seton, in that page dated March 14, 1805, and undoubtedly written under the overpowering impressions of that "day of days for her," clearly identify that 14th of March with the "day they receive Ashes, the beginning of Lent"? And if there were any doubts, we need but turn to that Note-book of hers, where, under the caption, *Dear Remembrances*, she wrote, according to Msgr. Seton's transcript:[10]

The thousand prayers, and tears, and cries from the uncertain soul which now succeeded until Ash Wednesday, 14th March, 1805, it entered the Ark of St. Peter with its beloved ones. Now the crowding remembrances, from that day to the 25th, of a first communion in the church of God.

"Ash Wednesday, 14th March, 1805": can there be anything more explicit? Yet the calendar's stony rigidity cannot yield; with mathematical-like obstinacy it points to February 27 as Ash Wednesday. Futile would it be to think our reckonings possibly at fault, owing to a change in the calendar; the Gregorian reform was adopted in England by an Act of Parliament in 1751, and became soon after applicable to the Colonies. Was then Mrs. Seton mistaken, or could anything take place in St. Peter's Church that Thursday morning, March 14, which she took for the ceremony of the Ashes?

Let us endeavor to untie, not to cut, this chronological gordian knot.

To begin with, no doubt that Mrs. Seton went to St. Peter's Church on Barclay Street, on March 14, 1805. There can scarcely be any question either as to her being received on that day in the Catholic Church. Of this proofs are in abundance. Besides her *Journal* to Amabilia Filicchi, there is the above-cited entry in her Note-book, written years after, which, no matter what may be thought of the identification of Ash Wednesday with the 14th of March, states explicitly that "14th March, it (her soul) entered the Ark of St. Peter;" there is likewise the inscription written on the copy of the *Following of Christ* which she gave to Antonio Filicchi: "Antonio Filicchi, from his dear Sister and friend, Eliza A. Seton, to commemorate the happy day he presented her to the Church of God, the 14th March, 1805;"[11] there is finally—for we must limit ourselves, but this last evidence speaks volumes—the singular devotion with which she ever kept the anniversary of that 14th of March. Of the most vivid and grateful remembrance she always treasured of that day, suffice here this one token, when in June, 1817, "preparing for death," she went over her papers and destroyed many of them, on fingering once more her *Journal* of 1805, she could not help jotting down these burning words:

[10] *Op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 156.

[11] Thus White, *op. cit.*, p. 153, note. Sister M. A. McCann cites this inscription in another form: "A memorial of his success in [illegible] soul's affairs." We cannot help looking with distrust at these quotation marks, and are afraid that the form given to the inscription was dictated by the singular opinion of the author about the day of in m[illegible] Seton's reception into the Church.

> Oh! that March 14, 1805!
> And I came up light at heart and cool of head the first time those many long months, but not without begging our Lord to wrap my heart deep in that opened side so well described in the beautiful crucifixion, or lock it up in His little tabernacle where I shall now rest forever.

"That March 14" was, with March 25, anniversary of her first communion, a date engraved in her heart in letters of fiery gold and treasured likewise by all those who lived in close intimacy with her. No wonder, therefore, that Father Bruté, to whom the sacred trust of examining Mother Seton's papers had been committed, noted (September, 1829) on some of the documents belonging to this momentous period of her life: "A most precious account of her entering the Church 14th March, 1805 . . . Keep this sacredly for use *in tempore opportuno*."

No doubt, then March 14, 1805, was the day on which Mrs. Seton was received in the Catholic Church. True it is that, in her letter of April 2 to Father Cheverus, she seems to intimate that her reception took place only March 15;[12] but whatever she may mean by this belongs to the discussion of what exactly took place in these two days, March 14 and 15; at any rate, the same context puts into particular prominence March 14 as the day in which "her soul offered all its hesitations and reluctancies a sacrifice with the blessed Sacrifice on the Altar;" and this is enough for the present argumentation.

Now who is the priest who, on the first coming to church of a Protestant telling him he or she has made up his or her mind to become a Catholic, will forthwith proceed to receive the abjuration and profession of faith of that person? Even in the absence of the most elementary rules of theology and the explicit directions of the Ritual, should not common sense dictate that he scrutinize the dispositions of this pretended convert? Has he not investigate whether baptism was ever received, and, in case it was, to inquire where, from whom, and what may be the value of that baptism, in order that he may determine whether a new (absolute or conditional) administration of the sacrament is not advisable? True, Mrs. Seton was not entirely unknown to Father William O'Brien, of St. Peter's Church; during the summer of 1804, Antonio Filicchi had in her interest gone to consult the worthy Dominican and shown him the paper wherein Mr. Hobart, the Episcopalian Rector of Trinity Church, had set forth the claims of his Church against Catholicism; and Father O'Brien had advised her reading *England's Conversion and Reformation*,[13] and had soon after replied to the Hobart manuscript.[14] In January 1805, Mrs. Seton herself had "tried so many ways to see Dr. O'Brien,"[15] but for reasons independent of the will of both, the interview did not take place.[16] Thus frustrated in her efforts to find at home the guidance she so sorely needed amidst the darkness wherein she was plunged, she resolved to appeal to the charity and zeal of Father Cheverus,[17] of whom she had heard from Antonio Filicchi, then at Boston. Let us take it for

---

[12] "My soul offered . . . on the 14th March & the next day was admitted to the true ch: of Jesus Christ."

[13] WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 113; DE BARBEREY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 257; SADLIER, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

[14] WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 117; SADLIER, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

[15] MSGR. SETON, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 210.

[16] WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 148; DE BARBEREY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 310; SADLIER, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

[17] WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 149; DE BARBEREY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 310; SADLIER, *op. cit.*, pp. 66–68; the answer of Father Cheverus is printed pp. 67–68; it was first published in the *Life of Mother Elizabeth Boyle*, Staten Island, N. Y., 1890, pp. 27–28. After citing this letter, Miss Sadlier writes: "Shortly after the receipt of this letter, Elizabeth received one from Antonio Filicchi, which had been written to him in regard to her by Bishop Carroll." This statement appears to be incorrect. Bishop Carroll's letter referred to is clearly, judging from the gist of it given by the author of *Elizabeth Seton*, p. 68, the same as may be read in WHITE, *op. cit.*, pp. 149–151, and MSGR. SETON, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 205–208, and dated January 13, 1805. Cheverus' letter was written March 4, and sent through Filicchi, because of the writer's ignorance of Mrs. Seton's address. In these conditions, that good Antonio actually communicated Cheverus' letter before Carroll's, as Miss A. Sadlier affirms, is so unnatural that the statement cannot be admitted without good documentary evidence to the

granted, moreover, that Father William O'Brien mentioned to his brother and fellow-worker at St. Peter's something about the prospective convert. All this notwithstanding, how can Father Mathew O'Brien be exculpated from the accusation of undue haste and rash disregard of the Ritual's implied injunction "to see to it that the postulant is exactly instructed in the Catholic faith and morals, to train him for some days in works of piety, to make sure that he perseveres in his purpose, to inquire diligently in what state and condition he is, particularly in regard to baptism previously received?"[18] Most hasty, too hasty, indeed, was certainly Father Mathew O'Brien if, as is asserted by all Mrs. Seton's historians, *the first time she went to St. Peter's Church*, on March 14, he at once received her abjuration and profession of faith.

Stranger still. Note, if you please, her reflection on her first visit to St. Peter's, touching "the drole, but most venerable Irish priest, who seems just come there;" he impresses her as if she has never seen him before, and, indeed, she cannot have seen him, since it is the first time she has come. Yet it was evidently by special appointment she went to the sacristy after the service: "After all were gone, *I was called* to the little room next the altar." Who then arranged for this appointment? No doubt, Antonio Filicchi, it will be said. If he did it just that very morning, Father O'Brien's haste was, as remarked above, inexplicable; if Filicchi had, on Mrs. Seton's behalf, made the necessary arrangements previously, is it not passing strange that everything, up to the supreme step of the convert's abjuration, was thus transacted by proxy?

On every side, improbabilities confront us. Of course, *Le vrai peut quelquefois n'être pas vraisemblable;* but to the unlikely history is loath to extend the right hand of friendship; only when it presents itself with proper high-class recommendations does she let it into the house.

Is the well-nigh incredible assertion implied in the narrative of our historians, to wit: that Mrs. Seton went to St. Peter's for the first time the day of her abjuration, March 14, sufficiently vouched for? Emphatically no. For Mrs. Seton herself asserts, and every one who has written on the subject repeats her assertion with perfect material correctness, that she went to St. Peter's for the first time on Ash Wednesday. The *Journal* to Amabilia Filicchi can indeed leave no doubt: "It was a day they receive the Ashes the beginning of Lent;" and the passage of her *Dear Remembrances* is in its own terse way quite as explicit: "The thousand prayers, and tears, and cries from the uncertain soul which now succeeded until Ash-Wednesday . . ." Only be it remembered that to say Ash Wednesday, 1805, is tantamount to saying February 27. On Ash Wednesday, February 27, therefore, should the first visit of Mrs. Seton to St. Peter's be dated.

This admitted, everything in this momentous period of her history succeeds in good order, the gordian knot of the impossible chronology hitherto blindly accepted is unloosed, and the otherwise inconceivable conduct of Father O'Brien proven to be according to the dictates of prudence and the rules of pastoral theology.

But what of the *Journal* of Mrs. Seton? What of her *Dear Remembrances*? Are not the texts absolutely incompatible with the view here advocated? On March 14, 1805, Mrs. Seton notes down her visit to the church of St. Peter; she was surprised, and had she not been so engrossed in her own thoughts, she would have been distracted by "the hurrying over one another" of the congregation going to receive the Ashes; she was, at first, a little startled, too, by the appearance of the priest, but

[18] Although the Ritual (Tit. II, Cap. 3) speaks all along of the *Baptizandi*, the rules laid down apply even when the convert is not to be baptized (Nos. 14 and 16). The question whether Mrs. Seton was actually baptized or not is in no way prejudicated.

soon "delighted and revived" by his speech; and after all were gone, she was called "to the little room next the altar," and there made her profession of faith. All things to the contrary notwithstanding, it was "Ash-Wednesday, 14 March, 1805," as she notes in her *Dear Remembrances*. Texts are texts; and Mrs. Seton ought to have known. Thus the objection, and we hope we have not minimized it.

Yes, Mrs. Seton ought to have known; and precisely because she did know, she could not say that March 14, the day she was received in the Church, was Ash-Wednesday, any more than I can say that today, Thursday, May 1st of the year of grace, 1919, is Easter Sunday. I go farther and add, precisely because she did know, what she did say *must mean something else*.

Was she not possibly in error, and may not something have taken place in the church on that Thursday morning, March 14, which she mistook for the ceremony of the Ashes? Mistaken a neophyte might well be, indeed, about some non-essential though time-honored rite. But she was not mistaken: "she knew not" then what that hurrying of the congregation meant. She knew it, though, when she penned her account of it; she had learned it in the meantime. When? When she went to the sacristy after the service? Possibly; although we may well suppose she had, on this her first visit to St. Peter's, more pressing thoughts to engross her mind than that of this little disorder. Much more probably, however, the explanation came some time between Ash-Wednesday and March 14. But this is re-asserting on the force of a new argument the affirmation that she first went to the church on Ash-Wednesday, February 27; it is not explaining directly the puzzling page of her *Journal*.

This page has an interesting history which cannot be deemed here irrelevant. The only printed English text of that part of Mrs. Seton's *Journal*, which extends from the 14th to the 25th of March, 1805, is in the *Memoirs* published by her grandson, Msgr. Seton.[19] He, no doubt, transcribed it from the manuscript preserved in the Archives of St. Joseph's, Emmitsburg. A mere glance, however, at the faithful copy given above will easily convince the most indulgent reader that the editor of the *Memoirs* took liberties with the original. His alterations—mostly suppressions—prompted, no doubt, by excellent reasons, bear, it must be owned, upon unessential words and clauses; still the very fact that he made alterations inspires a certain distrust and warrants caution in the use of his transcripts. We need not follow him here, at any rate, since we have an authentic copy of Mrs. Seton's manuscript.

This manuscript itself, though written by Mrs. Seton's own hand, is not, however, the original of the *Journal*. The original was sent to Amabilia Filicchi and, together with the letters to Antonio, is kept as a precious relic by the Filicchi family.[20] Of these papers a copy by Patrizio Filicchi was by him presented to Mrs. de Barberey when she was preparing her work; and there is every reason to believe that copy, work of love and religious veneration, is correct in every way. Now judging from Mrs. de Barberey's excerpts, there were, between the original sent to Leghorn and the copy kept by Mrs. Seton, slight differences, consisting principally in dates given in the one and omitted in the other. In the Emmitsburg manuscript the whole passage given above contains only one date, March 14, 1805, but the blanks interspersed here and there obviously separate the various entries. The Leghorn manuscript fills

[19] White, *op. cit.*, p. 152, weaves into his narrative phrases of the entry of March 14, but does not cite it at length; he reproduces, though (pp. 153–155), the text from the words: "So delighted now to prepare for this good confession," to the end of the entry of March 25.

[20] De Barberey, Vol. i, p. 13: "M. Patrizio Filicchi, le fils aîné du noble Antonio, conserve comme un trésor les lettres que son père avait reçues d'elle (Mrs. Seton). C'est tout un volume manuscrit." The volume must have naturally contained also the letters to Amabilia, Antonio's wife and Patrizio's mother.

the blanks, dating the several entries. Thus, before the paragraph: "So delighted now to prepare . . .," we find the date, March 16, 1805; the next entry: "It is done—easy enough . . ." belongs to March 20; the rest of the passage cited above is marked March 22; and it is followed by a long one, bearing the date March 25, containing the outpourings of Mrs. Seton's fervor after her first communion.

Only the first portion, that written on March 14, must presently detain our attention. Even material details here have a value and must be carefully pondered over. That entry of the 14th of March is made up of three different paragraphs. After the general statement brimming over with intense emotion: "A day of days for me, Amabilia," the writer notes she has gone to the Catholic church of New York. This in itself, though still vague, must be—and she knew it—to her friend a foretaste of most happy news. Not long since, late in December, 1804, Mrs. Seton had recorded a desperate visit to St. George's (Protestant) Church; and even though she noted then that she, that day, left the house a Protestant, but returned to it a Catholic, or, at any rate, determined to go no more to the Protestants,[21] and still, a few weeks later (February 15), seemed resolved to "go peaceably and firmly to the Catholic Church," yet in her letter (February 19) to Father Cheverus, so far as we can surmise from his answer, she confessed "her conscience whispers sometimes that she is too partial to the catholic side" and is not free from doubts and anxieties. The news of her going to St. Peter's, then, was tantamount to the announcement that all hesitations were at last put an end to. Mark, however, that she does not say that this "day of days" is the first time she has gone to St. Peter's.

The second paragraph depicts vividly her impressions of her *first* visit to the church "which has a cross on the top instead of a weathercock." It happened on Ash Wednesday, as she has learned since. Why, it will be asked, does she not specify: "When (on going there February 27 last) I turned to the corner of the street it is in . . ."? We offer no other explanation but that she is writing under an overpowering emotion; at all events, Amabilia will easily make out that, as that first visit, which Mrs. Seton now describes, took place on Ash-Wednesday, evidently she is not speaking of what has just happened on the day she writes, March 14.

What has just taken place on that "day of days," she now goes on to tell in the last paragraph: "After all had departed . . ." Here again we should like to find a few words making the meaning perfectly clear, something like: "This morning, after all had departed . . ." But insisting upon this paragraph is useless, Mrs. Seton herself, as has been seen above, and all her historians after her, dating her reception into the Catholic Church on that day.

In short, this entry of March 14 could be summed up in the following words: "Amabilia, I am now a Catholic: I first went to St. Peter's on Ash-Wednesday, and today have just been received in the Church."

Neither is, despite first appearances, the passage of Mrs. Seton's *Dear Remembrances* leastwise in opposition to the conclusions advocated above, once its text is accurately established as Mrs. Seton jotted it down, and a few obvious remarks are borne in mind. Mrs. de Barberey, who has left out one of the crucial words and made a little change at the end of the clause, renders the passage as follows:[22]

> . . . qui se succédèrent jusqu'au mercredi 14 mars 1805, jour où j'entrai dans l'arche du Seigneur . . .

[21] Msgr. Seton, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 214; White, *op. cit.*, p. 147; De Barberey, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 298. Msgr. Seton seems to date this passage January, 1805; White gives it after a fragment of a letter rightly dated November, 1804. Mrs. de Barberey's dating, December 19, 1804, is undoubtedly correct: in September, Mrs. Seton, prevailed upon by her desire for peace and by "persuasion about properties, &c.," had gone to St. Paul's; in the first days of January, she had taken "the desperate resolution to remain till the moment of death of no religion at all" (*Journal*, probably written in 1815); her visit to St. George's must come before this "desperate resolution."

[22] *Op. cit.* Vol. ii, p. 454.

Here is exactly the text as found in the original of this note, preserved in the Archives of St. Joseph's, Emmitsburg:

> . . . the thousand tears of prayers and cries from the uncertain soul which now succeeded, until Ash Wednesday 14th March 1805 it entered the Ark of St. Peter with its beloved ones.

Mrs. de Barberey's departure from this text, slight as it is, is surprising, for usually she abides scrupulously by the original sources. A collation with the transcript of Msgr. Seton, as reproduced faithfully in the beginning of this paper, reveals that the good prelate, too, prevaricated. Waiving his unwarranted change of the "tears of prayers," we have, however, no grievous fault to find with his trying to introduce modern punctuation in these lines; for publishing his documents not with a view to cater to historians, but rather for edification, his solicitude to make his text intelligible to a modern reader was praiseworthy; every one acquainted with century old documents, especially letters and memorandums like the present, is fully conversant with the economy of punctuation marks practised in those days. The point, then, is: Did the editor, in introducing *his* punctuation marks, enter exactly into the meaning of his grandmother's text? No; since she could not possibly have any idea of identifying Ash-Wednesday, 1805, with the 14th of March. What she meant, then, was to mark the whole course of her entrance in the Church, *from* Ash-Wednesday, when she took the first definite step to that effect by going to St. Peter's, *to* March 14, when she was received. We would, therefore, suggest the following typographical arrangement, instead of that of Msgr. Seton, as expressing more accurately this meaning:

> . . . which now succeeded, until (Ash-Wednesday—14th March, 1805) it entered . . .

II

Vexing as is the chronological puzzle which the foregoing pages have attempted to solve, it is not more so than the problem of what exactly took place on March 14 at St. Peter's when Mrs. Seton was received into the Catholic Church. That she made abjuration of Protestantism and profession of the Catholic faith goes without saying; the Roman Ritual enjoins this previous "confession and detestation of the perverseness of their errors" upon all heretics who enter the Catholic fold, whether their baptism was valid or not. As a matter of fact, our often quoted *Journal* is most explicit on this point. The whole question, then, in the present instance, is reduced to the simple query: Was Mrs. Seton baptized in the Catholic Church?

Dr. White entertained little doubt that baptism must have intervened; for, citing (p. 156) Mrs. Seton's letter to Father Cheverus, upon the words: "My soul has offered all its hesitations and reluctances a sacrifice with the blessed sacrifice on the altar, on the 14th of March, and the next day was admitted to the true Church of Christ," he comments in a footnote: "By admission to the true Church, Mrs. Seton probably means that she was baptized conditionally and approached the sacrament of penance."[23] Before Dr. White, the author of a *Sketch of Mother Seton* printed in the Catholic Directory or Clergy List of 1842, had already committed himself to the statement that the subject of the sketch was baptized in St. Peter's in 1805, adding, moreover, that she then took the name Mary—an erroneous assertion, as Mrs. Seton received that name at confirmation, on May 26, 1806.[24] More modern historians of Elizabeth Ann Seton, however, word very guardedly their narratives of her recep-

[23] *Op. cit.*, p. 156.

[24] White, *op. cit.*, p. 176; Msgr. Seton, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 248; De Barberey, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 377. There is, in regard to this date, a slight difficulty arising from the text of a letter to Antonio Filicchi as given by Mrs. de Barberey; there must be here a misprint or a mistranslation: May 26, 1806, was Pentecost Monday.

tion into the Church; and none of them makes the least reference to baptism. Had they doubts, or did they simply take the matter for granted?

Ad jus quod attinet, as canonists say, the discipline then in vigor in the American Church was that codified at the Synod held in Baltimore in 1791:[25]

> As nothing in religion is more holy and precious than the Sacraments, every possible care must be taken in regard to their right administration and their worthy reception. Beginning, therefore, with Baptism, which ushers men into the Christian Society, considering that in this country we live amidst a number of heretical sects which either do not administer Baptism at all, or administer it only to adults, or, denying its necessity for salvation, are very remiss in its administration; we ordain:
>
> 1. That conditional Baptism be conferred on those of the reality of whose Baptism moral certitude, after diligent inquiry, cannot be obtained; also that infants, baptized in danger of death by heretical or even Catholic midwives, be likewise baptized conditionally, unless the Catholic midwives are such that no prudent doubt can be entertained as to the validity of the baptism conferred by them. However, the pastors should keep carefully from re-baptizing indiscriminately, without making any inquiries, those who are not baptized by a priest; lest they incur the irregularity enacted by Pope Alexander III against those who repeat Baptism.
>
> 2. We ordain that the Pastors, inasmuch as lies in their power, write down in the Register kept for that purpose, the names and age of all baptized persons, also the names of the parents and of the sponsors.
>
> 3. When adult heretics validly baptized are converted to the faith, it is not necessary to supply the ceremonies omitted in their Baptism.

In the present instance, we may well take it for granted that, according to the axiom of law, "everything was actually done that should have been done:" the undoubted earnestness of the convert, the well-known learning, virtue and sterling priestly character of the pastor of St. Peter's, the interest taken in the affair by men of the stamp of Father Cheverus and Bishop Carroll, not to mention Antonio Filicchi, fully warrant the assumption.

The facts, now. Elizabeth Ann Bayley was born in New York, the 28th of August, 1774. The Bayleys attending Trinity (Protestant Episcopal) Church, it is quite natural to suppose she was baptized there. No record of the event, however, is extant, for the Baptismal Register perished in the fire which destroyed Trinity Church on September 21, 1776. Owing to the child's grandfather, Richard Charlton, being since 1747 rector of St. Andrew's Church, Richmond, Staten Island,[26] the baptism might possibly have been reserved to the venerable clergyman; accordingly a search was made in the baptismal records of that church, but it proved fruitless.

Lamentable though it is, the lack of documentary evidence of Elizabeth's baptism does not authorize the harbouring of any suspicions as to the actuality of the fact. Only two considerations would be of such a nature as to suggest doubt. In the first place, some Protestant sects, and many Protestant people, consider baptism an unessential ceremony, good in itself, but which may be dispensed with; it is sure that Elizabeth's parents did not share in this belief? The question is all the

---

[25] *Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum Collectio Lacensis*, Tom. iii, pp. 2–3.

[26] The church on Staten Island, of which Mrs. Seton's maternal grandfather was rector, is usually referred to by her historians as "St. Ann's." There was never any church of that name on the island. We have here another evidence of the blind faith with which our historians uncritically copy one another. "St. Andrew's Church was built in 1713 by the Rev. Eneas McKensie, in the administration of Governor Robert Hunter, under a charter of Queen Anne, who presented the Church with prayer-books, pulpit cover and a silver communion service with her name inscribed thereon." *Annals of Staten Island from Its Discovery to the Present Time*, by J. J. Clute. New York, 1877, pp. 262–263. "In 1747 the Rev. Richard Charlton became rector: his eldest daughter was connected by marriage to the Dongan family, and another daughter was the wife of Dr. Richard Bailey, who was Health Officer of the Port of New York and died in 1801; his remains are interred in the graveyard of the church. Dr. Charlton's ministry continued 32 years; he died in 1779 and was buried under the church."—*Ibid.*, p. 264.

more pertinent because Dr. Richard Bayley, Elizabeth's father, is usually described as inclined to what, at the close of the eighteenth century, was called "philosophical ideas." "He does not appear," writes his great-grandson, "to have inculcated any very positive Christianity on his family, for this favored daughter of his once told one of her own children that she never heard him pronounce the name of Jesus Christ until he lay on his death-bed."[27] This is the second consideration possibly capable of casting a doubt upon the fact of Elizabeth's baptism.

These considerations, however, can have no weight here. No matter, indeed, how certain Protestants regard baptism, it is hard to believe, at any rate, their lax opinion was shared in by Elizabeth's mother, the daughter of a clergyman highly esteemed for the conscientious discharge of his duties. On the other hand, great as may have been Dr. Bayley's "philosophical" inclinations, and although it was possibly on his advice that his brilliant daughter, then seventeen or eighteen years of age, read Voltaire and Rosseau, yet he does not appear to be an anti-religious man, or alien to Christian sentiments, who used to carry about in his portfolio a picture of the crucifixion,[28] and who accepted to act as sponsor at the baptism of all his daughter's children born during his lifetime;[29] and if, as historians aver, he exercised a preponderating, nay, even a well-nigh exclusive influence on the education of his daughter, the fruits yielded by that education from Elizabeth's earliest years enable us to judge the educator. Once more let us turn to her *Dear Remembrances*:[30]

> At four years of age—sitting alone on a step of the doorway looking at the clouds, while my little sister Catharine, two years old, lay in her coffin; they asked me: did I not cry when little Kitty was dead? No, because Kitty is gone up to heaven. I wish I could go too with mamma.
>
> At six—taking my little sister Emma up to the highest window, and showing her the setting sun, told her God lived up in heaven, and good children would go up there. Teaching her her prayers. My poor mother in law,[31] then in great affliction, taught me the 22nd Psalm: *The Lord is my shepherd, the Lord ruleth me. . . . Though I walk in the midst of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me;* and all through life it has been the favourite one.
>
> New Rochelle—Miss Molly B.'s—at eight years of age. . . . Admiration of the clouds. Delight to gaze at them: always with the look for my mother and little Kitty in heaven. . . . Every little leaf, and flower, or insect, animal, shades of clouds, or moving trees, objects of vacant, unconnected thought of God and heaven. Pleasure in learning any thing pious. . .
>
> Twelve years old—Foolish, ignorant, childish heart. Home again at my father's. Pleasure in reading prayers. Love to nurse the children and sing little hymns over their cradle. A night passed in terror, saying all the while, *our Father*.
>
> Fourteen years of age.—At uncle B.'s, New Rochelle, again. The Bible so enjoyed, and Thomson and Milton. Hymns said on the rocks, surrounded with ice, in transports of first pure enthusiasm. Gazings at the stars—Orion. Walk among cedars singing hymns. . . . Joy in God that He was my Father. Insisting that He should not forsake me. My father away, perhaps dead; but God was my Father, and I quite independent of whatever might happen. . . . At home. Methodist spinning girls. Their continual hymn "*And am I only born to die*," made deep impression.

Here, then, is a child who, at four years of age, has learned—no one will say she has that knowledge by intuition—of heaven as the bright abode of innocence and goodness; who, at six, has been made familiar with the thought of God, knows

---

[27] Msgr. Seton, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 13.
[28] Msgr. Seton, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 200; De Barberey, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 269.
[29] See below the records of the baptism of Mrs. Seton's children.
[30] Msgr. Seton, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 148–150; De Barberey, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 443–446.
[31] A colloquial, now obsolete English expression for stepmother.

her prayers and teaches them to her little sister, appreciates the tender *abandon* of the Psalmist's trust in God; who, some two years later, is naturally reminded of God by every object which meets her gaze, and finds "pleasure in learning anything pious," in reading prayers, in singing hymns as other children sing ditties. . . . Certainly in the atmosphere of the home where that child grew up there was the soft warmth of religion; apparently the "philosophical ideas" of the father were not averse to the worship of the God whom the "philosophers" themselves extolled so often in their books; at the Doctor's side was a woman with a pious turn of mind, seeking comfort in the words of the inspired poet-king, and who cannot be thoughs of as frowning upon her step-daughter's visible inclination to religion.[32] Neither does it seem that in the home of the Bayleys of New Rochelle Elizabeth breathed a different atmosphere: there it was that she "so enjoyed the Bible," and no reason whatever can be adduced to suppose that she, who was straightforwardness personified,[33] read the Bible by stealth. Whichever side we turn, therefore, we find her in surroundings where religion was in honor and where we cannot detect any laxness in regard to a sacrament which the Catechism of the Episcopal Church considered absolutely essential.

She, indeed, had never any doubts concerning her baptism. Of this her unhesitating conviction we hear an echo in a letter to Amabilia Filicchi, written July 19, 1804, only a few weeks after her return from Italy. Following a few lines on the impressions caused on her by the recent death of her sister-in-law, Rebecca Seton, she remarks:[34] "I had a most affectionate note from Mr. Hobart today, asking me how I could ever think of leaving the Church in which I was baptized." Furthermore, her care about the baptism of her own children is the best evidence of her view regarding this sacrament. The records of Trinity Church, in their official conciseness, tell sufficiently the story.

June 4, 1795. ANNA MARIA,
born May 3, 1795.
Parents: William Magee and Elizabeth A. Seton.
Sponsors: Richard Bailey, Mary Fitch of Jamaica and Rebecca Seton.[35]

December 24, 1796. WILLIAM,
born November 25, 1796.
Parents: William M. and Elizabeth A. Seton.
Sponsors: Richard Bailey, Joseph Covachichi and Mary Post.[36]

[32] What Mrs. Seton writes of her stepmother's death, in a letter to Antonio Filicchi, dated September 9, 1805 (De Barberey, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 348–349), is no indication that Mrs. Bayley was not a religious woman. Mrs. Seton simply compares the death of a Catholic surrounded by all the comforts of religion to that of the Protestants "who die without sacraments, without prayers, unaided at their last moment in the struggle of failing nature, deprived of the consolation which Almighty God has so abundantly bestowed upon us." This was no new impression upon her mind. Already in July, 1804, while still a Protestant, at the bedside of her dearest sister-in-law Rebecca Seton, the same thought had forced itself upon her mind, as we see in a letter of hers to Amabilia Filicchi of July 19: "The impressions . . . and the different scenes I passed through in Leghorn are far from being effaced from my mind, which indeed could not help even in the most painful moments of attendance on my beloved sister, making the strong comparison of a sick and dying person in your happy country, where the poor sufferer is soothed and strengthened at once by every help of religion; where the one you call *Father* of your soul attends and watches it in the weakness and trials of parting nature, with the same care you and I watch our little infant's body in its first struggles and wants on its entrance into life. Dearest Rebecca! how many looks of silent distress have we exchanged about this last passage, this breaking of time into eternity!" Msgr. Seton, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 195; De Barberey, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 249. The same vivid impression is given utterance to in a letter to Antonio Filicchi, dated March 14, 1807, at the occasion of the death of Mrs. Maitland (Eliza Seton); whom she had assisted in her last moments: "Oh, how awful! without prayer, without sacrament, without faith! Terrified, impatient, wretched! How shall we ever praise enough that mercy which has placed us in the bosom of our mother!"—White, *op. cit.*, p. 195; De Barberey, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 391.

[33] In 1793 her father wrote to her: "You will never deceive your father in thought or word."—Msgr. Seton, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 12.

[34] Msgr. Seton, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 195; De Barberey, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 249.

[35] Records of Trinity Church Baptisms, Vol. i, p. 327.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 342(?).

August 20, 1798. RICHARD BAILEY,
born July 20, 1798.
Parents: William M. and Elizabeth A. Seton.
Sponsors: Richard Bailey, Joseph Covachichi and Mary Post.[37]

November 19, 1800. CATHERINE CHARLTON,
born June 28, 1800.
Parents: William M. and Elizabeth A. Seton.
Sponsors: Mary Post, Catherine Duplex, Juliana Scott, Richard Bailey and Richard Curson Jr.[38]

September 29, 1802. REBECCA,
born August 20, 1802.
Parents: William M. and Elizabeth A. Seton.
Sponsors: William M. Seton and Elizabeth Sadler.[39]

From these records it will be seen that all, Catherine excepted, were baptized within a reasonable time—about one month—after their birth. The exception is interesting, in so far as it reveals Elizabeth's dislike of the delay, a dislike of which she explains clearly the cause and origin in a letter to her friend Julia Scott, who was to be the child's godmother:[40]

> As to our sweet babe, I think you would wish to be its nurse as well as godmother . . . Gyles told us you were to be here in a month from the time he left you; but the month is past and no Julia, nor do you intimate that you are coming. How well we might have managed, for you could have personally received your little daughter; but as it is I will defer having her christened until we go to town,[41] though against my inclination, for I think the covenant should be entered into as soon as possible, as it is too sacred to be trusted to accident.

Any person thinking the baptism covenant "too sacred to be trusted to accident" could not have any doubts indeed as to her own baptism. Nor can we.

But what was the value of this baptism? How was it looked upon by the Catholic clergy?

A letter to Bishop Carroll to Antonio Filicchi, dated Baltimore, January 18, 1805, acquaints us sufficiently with the Bishop's view of Mrs. Seton's Episcopalian baptism:[42]

> As far as it is in my power to judge of her state of mind, from the account of it contained in your letters, I do not think it advisable for her, at present, to perplex herself with reading any more controversy. She has seen enough on that subject to assure herself of the true principles for settling her faith. Her great business now should be to beseech our Divine Redeemer *to revive in her heart the grace of her baptism*, and to fortify her soul in the resolution of following unreservedly the voice of God speaking in her heart, however difficult and painful the sacrifices may be which it requires.

In Cheverus' letter of March 4 we find no such estimate, even when, after advising her, as the Bishop, that, in her present state of mind, "the reading of all controversial works would be perfectly useless," he adds further below: "It appears to me, that if at times you have doubts, anxieties, you are never for a moment a strong Protestant, although you are often, as you say, a good Catholic, and I believe you are always a good Catholic." Obviously, the eminent writer in these words means

---

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 352.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 361.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 370.
[40] MSGR. SETON, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 64–65.
[41] Mrs. Seton was then on Staten Island at her father's cottage near the Health Establishment.
[42] WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 150; MSGR. SETON, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 206. Italics ours.

to speak of her convictions, in perfect accordance with the Catholic faith. But, less than a year later, he did not hesitate to commit himself to an explicit statement in regard to the value he attached to the Episcopalian baptism of Cecilia Seton, Elizabeth's sister-in-law. Cecilia, then scarcely fifteen years old, was taken gravely ill during the winter 1805–1806. She begged that Elizabeth, whom she loved most tenderly and whom the Seton family had absolutely "cut off" since her conversion, should be allowed to come to see her. At once Mrs. Seton hurried to her bedside. But what should she do in the present juncture for the salvation, which she had so much at heart, of the dearly beloved child? She was afraid of speaking too much or too little; and once more she turned for light to Boston. Here is on this delicate point the answer of Father Cheverus:[42]

> I must first tell you that your conscience ought to be free from scruples about the past, since you have done, in regard to your interesting sister, everything which you thought discretion and prudence would allow. In her present situation is it your duty to go farther? I am at a loss myself how to give an answer to this question. I have for these few days consulted in prayer the Father of lights, I have endeavored to place myself in your situation. Here is the result, which, however, I propose to you with the utmost diffidence.
>
> Neither the obstacles you mention, nor the sickly state of the dear child, permit to instruct her in the points of controversy. What you have told her till now appears to me nearly sufficient. I would recall to her, when opportunity should offer, the amiable and pious wish of living one day in a convent, and there to become a member of the Church. Should she ask any questions, I would answer in few words, without entering into the particular merits of the question, telling her that when she is better you will examine the matter together; that, at present, it is enough to know Jesus and Him crucified, to put all her trust in Him, to suffer with Him, etc., to wish to become a member of His Church. Which Church is His? she will, perhaps, say, Answer: the Catholic, because it is the most ancient. If she asks no questions, I would confine myself to what you have said to her before. It is important that you may continue to visit her. Everything that would put an end to your intercourse with her must be avoided. The most embarrassing circumstance will be when you will see her near the period of the fatal disorder. Then, perhaps, you will be with her oftener and alone. Let the love of our adorable Saviour in His sacrament and on the cross be the subject of your discourse. You might also mention the anointing of the sick in St. James and if she desires it and it can be done, *procure to her the blessing of the last sacraments.* Could they be hard-hearted enough to refuse such a request, and at such a time? The whole weight of their displeasure will fall upon you, but God has given you strength to bear it, and will make rich amends by His interior consolations. It is probable, however, that you will not find an opportunity of accomplishing this. Should it unhappily be the case, you will have nothing to reproach yourself with; for if you attempt to do more than the above, it is almost certain that you will be hindered from doing anything at all.
>
> *Your beloved sister has been made by baptism a member of the Church.* Wilful error, I have reason to think, has never separated her from that Sacred body. Her singular innocence of mind and ardent piety have also, very likely preserved her from offending God in any grievous manner, and I hope, in consequence, that even if she cannot receive the sacraments, she will be a member of the triumphant church in heaven, although it would be to her an unspeakable advantage to receive the sacraments, and would render her salvation more secure.

Mrs. Seton's zeal, prudence and discretion had soon their reward, for one day that the two sisters-in-law were left alone, Cecilia, although realizing perfectly what dire consequences would eventually follow the accomplishment of her resolution, confided to Elizabeth she had made up her mind to become a Catholic. Owing to

[42] WHITE, *op. cit.*, pp. 183–185; MSGR. SETON, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 240–242. Italics ours.

her condition, the fulfilment of her desire had to be postponed until her complete recovery. But we are not so much interested presently in Cecilia's conversion and the price the beautiful, heroic little soul had to pay for it, as in Cheverus' opinion on the value of her Episcopalian baptism.[44] If he advises Mrs. Seton "with the utmost diffidence" touching the course to follow in her dealings with the sick girl, he uses no such rhetorical precautions about his assertion of Cecilia being "by baptism a member of the Church." Humble Father Cheverus requested Mrs. Seton to communicate his letter to Father Tisserant and to "beg of him to correct anything which should not be perfectly exact." That Father Tisserant endorsed the letter is indirectly proven by the fact that the Baptismal Register is again absolutely silent about the baptism of Cecilia, who, to the great delight of her sister-in-law, was received in the Church on the 20th of June.

One month after the latter event, Annina, Mrs. Seton's eldest daughter, made her first communion. It will be recalled that, on the 14th of March, 1805, Mrs. Seton wrote: "Anna suspects" (her mother's conversion). "I anticipate her delight when I take her next Sunday." Neither Anna, therefore, nor any other of the children had she taken to church with her on the day of her profession of faith. Yet, recalling later the emotions of that "day of days for her," she said her soul "entered the Ark of St. Peter with its beloved ones." If the clergy, indeed, had satisfied themselves of the validity of her baptism, they must be satisfied likewise of that of her children's. No wonder, then, that neither the name of Anna Maria nor those of her two brothers and two sisters are to be found in the Baptismal Register of St. Peter's, and that henceforth we see them accompanying in turns their mother to church, and one after another making their first communion in due time without further ado.

Three years later (1809), at Emmitsburg, the Seton family counted another convert, Harriet, Cecilia's sister.[45] As in the case of the others, no record of her baptism is extant. Here, however, the absence of testimonial cannot be construed into even a presumption that she did not receive conditional baptism; for already, at the time of Father Bruté's rectorship of the parish, no records prior to 1812 were in existence. Neither can the words of Harriet's *Memorandum* be understood of her recent baptism:[46]

> September 24th—Day of the Blessed Virgin of Marcy—Received my first Communion. On the same day made a renewal of my baptismal vows.

The renewal here mentioned was a ceremony, probably of French origin, usually taking place on the day of the first communion.

Leaving aside, therefore, this case of Harriet Seton, in view of the injunction of the Synod of Baltimore and of the practice of the priests at the time, of faithfully registering baptisms, both absolute and conditional, and even the supplying of baptismal ceremonies,[47] the fact that no entry is found of the (conditional) baptism of either Mrs. Seton, or her children, or her sister-in-law Cecilia can be assigned no other cause than that none of these converts was even conditionally baptized.

What, then, did Mrs. Seton mean in her letter of April 2, 1805, to Father Che-

---

[44] Cecilia had been baptized in Trinity Church by Dr. Moore.
[45] She, too, like her sister, had been baptized by Dr. Moore at Trinity Church.
[46] Msgr. Seton, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 56.
[47] Of the exactitude of the priests in recording baptisms, and even the supplying of baptismal ceremonies, we have evidences in the old Baptismal Registers which have been published. Suffice it to mention here the *List of Baptisms registered at St. Joseph's Church, Philadelphia*, printed in the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, Vol. i, pp. 246 and foll. No record seems to have been kept in Baptismal Registers of cases like that of Mrs. Seton, where there was not even the supplying of ceremonies; nor indeed was it the place for such entries: if they were made anywhere, it should be rather in the *Liber Status Animarum*. An investigation in that direction might repay the trouble.

verus, when, after mentioning the 14th of March, she adds: "and *the next day* was admitted to the true Church of Jesus Christ"?

Were we to follow Msgr. Seton's text, no difficulty would be in the way, for he simply leaves out the troubling words: "the next day." But these words are in the original of Mrs. Seton's letter, and the difficulty arising from them is not solved by wantonly amputating them against all rules of historical criticism. An explanation, then, must be found, for these words must have a meaning. Now if we advert to the statement of the *Journal*, that on the 14th of March, 1805, Mrs. Seton made *profession of faith*, and to the wording of the inscription written on the copy of A Kempis given to Antonio Fillicchi, that, on that day, he *presented* her to the Church, it may well be that, when she speaks of her being admitted to the true Church on March 15, she refers to the absolution of the censures which follows the profession of faith and was postponed until the morrow. There is certainly no more insuperable objection to this postponement than there could be to the delay of conditional baptism, if conditional baptism there must be as Dr. White intimates.

Let it be borne in mind, however, that the conclusion here advocated—namely, that neither Mrs. Seton nor her children and her sister-in-law received conditional baptism on their entrance in the Catholic Church—cannot be given the note of absolute certitude. Dr. White's hypothesis still remains possible; for, after all, the clergy of St. Peter may not have been in the habit of registering conditional baptisms of converts, or even if they were, may, absolutely speaking, have been remiss in this part of their duty in this particular case. As a matter of fact, and not to go much outside of Mrs. Seton's circle, when Mr. S. Cooper was received in the Church by Father M. Hurley, O.S.A., in the fall of 1807, in St. Augustine's church, Philadelphia, no record was entered in the Baptismal Register at the time; nevertheless, a few years later, in order to enable Mr. Cooper to receive Orders, Father Hurley drew up a certificate attesting the fact of the convert's baptism at the time of his reception into the Church.[48]

Still these considerations affect in no way the status of the question in regard to Mrs. Seton, for Father Hurley may have entertained, touching the protestant baptism of Mr. Cooper, doubts which the protestant baptism of Mrs. Seton did not legitimate; each case is to be judged on its own merits and dealt with accordingly. On the whole, then, the probability against Mrs. Seton's baptism at St. Peter's remains extremely great and bordering on certitude, whereas the probability of her being baptized is hardly more than a mere possibility.

By way of conclusion, let us sketch briefly in correct chronological order the events of these few weeks of Mrs. Seton's life.

The year 1805 began for her in the same spiritual darkness and misery in which she had groped during the last few months. On Sunday, December 17, "in desperation of heart," she had gone to St. George's Episcopal church; but, "being much more troubled than ever," she had, on returning home, "determined to go no more to the Protestants." Epiphany Day, therefore, she spent at home, "alone with God," she says, "in so singular a manner as to take the desperate resolution to remain till the moment of death of no religion at all, since I could not find out the right one. With what ardor and firmness I would stretch out arms to Him and cry, I will hold to you in life and death, and hope and trust to the last breath. Then . . . dusting a volume of our Bourdaloue, I opened the very festival and on the words: O you, who have lost the star of faith! Then the torrents of distress and anguish overwhelming again. To see a Catholic priest, O it was the only supreme

[48] This certificate is in the Archives of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia.

desire on earth." Once more she resolved, after heartily committing her cause to God, again to read these books, on the Catholic faith which had first won her towards it, and in consequence would, she hoped, with a helping hand from above, lead her to it; and then it was she "tried so many ways" to have an interview with Father O'Brien. Unable to meet the priest, she penned a letter to Bishop Carroll, "but his silence to Mr. Anthony's letter makes me hesitate to send mine," she remarks.

Meanwhile, her friends made use of every argument to dissuade her from becoming a Catholic. "Now they tell me," she writes to Amabilia on February 15, "to take care, that I am a mother, and must answer for my children at the judgment seat, whatever faith I lead them to . . . That being so, I will go peaceably and firmly to the Catholic Church. For if faith is so important to our salvation, I will seek it where the true faith first began, will seek it among those who received it from God himself." "I will go peaceably and firmly . . ." The day was drawing near, but it had not yet come. Neither her fervent prayers nor her penances so long persevered in dispelled the doubts. Finding no help near, she determined (February 19) to seek the advice of Father Cheverus, of whom Antonio Filicchi had written so highly in his letters from Boston. Before the learned and zealous missionary was able to answer, Antonio Filicchi had returned to New York and communicated to his still hesitating friend Bishop Carroll's long-delayed reply (January 13) to his letter sent from Boston on October 4. Mrs. Seton should beseech our Lord "to fortify her soul in the resolution of following unreservedly the voice of God speaking to her heart, however difficult and painful the sacrifice may be which it requires." This letter, it seems, was the ray from heaven which dispelled all her hesitations. On Ash Wednesday, February 27, she went to St. Peter's and prepared for her reception in the Church. Cheverus' answer, dated March 4, and received some days later, could but encourage her in the course she had entered upon; and indeed, "with a mind grateful and satisfied as that of a poor shipwrecked mariner on being restored to his home," she made, on the 14th of March, her profession of faith at the hands of Rev. Mathew O'Brien and in presence of Antonio Filicchi.

Anxious to leave, on commencing a new existence, no page of her past life unscrutinized, five days she prepared for her general confession, which was made on March 20, with what sentiments of faith and appreciation of the Sacrament the *Journal* reveals. Five more days of intensely fervent preparation, and the blessed hour came when, in her soul's exstasis, she could write:

> At last, Amabilia, at last, God is mine and I am His. Now let all earthly things go as they will. *I have received Him* . . .

CHARLES L. SOUVAY, C. M., D.D.,
Kenrick Seminary,
St. Louis, Mo.

DOCUMENTS

BISHOP PURCELL'S JOURNAL, 1833–1836

(Contributed by Sister Mary Agnes McCann, Ph.D.)

Redde Rationem Villicationis Tuae.—Luke, xvi, 2.

1833—Nov.

Having resolved to keep a faithful account of my administration of the diocese of Ohio and of the remarkable events, ecclesiastical and political, connected with it, or interesting to the Holy Cause of Religion in these U. S., I begin from the epoch of my acceptance of the appointment, confirmed by the Holy See, to chronicle in this Journal, whatever it will be given me to use useful to myself, profitable to my clergy, a light to my flock & a guide to my successor when I am in the house of my eternity, the Mansions of glory which my Saviour has bought for me with his blood, which my Father above has prepared & which the Most Holy Spirit that proceedeth from the Father and the Son, I confidently hope, will enable me by efficacious grace to secure.

As soon as the various Catholic newspapers announced my nomination—which Rt. Revd. Dr. England informed me by letter from Rome, had been made—not by him, but by Prelates of the U. S. in his absence, I was importuned by Parents and Guardians of the Scholars under my care at Mt. St. Mary's College for information as to the probability who wd be my successor—For a considerable time, I was at a loss what answer to return—Revd. Mr. Hayden was consulted & offered the Presidency of the Institution. He declined the charge & Revd. Mr. Jamison was approved, at my suggestion, by the Abp. for the onerous duty of President. Revd. Mr. Wainwright of the Balte. Cathedral having brought me the Apostolic Brief of my election to the See of Cincinnati, in the begin. of Aug. 1833, I made a retreat with the Seminarians—conducted by Revd. Mr. Bruté, to implore the Divine Light that I may the will of God [*sic*]—I consulted enlightened, old and pious friends—they advised the course I have pursued. . . . Agreed wth the Most Revd. ArchB. that the consecration shd take place on the 13th October. Made a re-retreat at Conewago—where Revd. Messrs. Lekeu and Paul Kohlman exercised the virtue of hospitality in my regard and edified me much by their unaffected piety. Revd. Mr. Hickey kindly came to hear my confession. From that moment to my consecration, he never left me.

My consecration took place on the 13th Oct. 1833. (See the various Catholic Papers of the U. S. for a description of the ceremony and that of the opening of the Provincial Council on the Sunday fol.) From the 10th to the 20th, Rt. Revd. Bps. DuBois and Kenrick went to the Mountain. I staid in Baltimore where I was politely and kindly entertained by Mr. Francis Elder & Lady & Sister, Miss Laura Laurenson. We, the Bishops, dined at Mr. Caton's & McTavish's, where it was unpleasant to hear so many family secrets & scandals about the division of old Mr. Charles Carroll's estates. I made a hasty visit to the district of Cola. to see Revd. Mr. Schreiber & G. T. College before I left the East. Heard

of the attempt of the students of George T. Coll. to mob and abuse their Prefect, Mr. Lancaster—Experienced kindness from Messrs. John White, Abraham White, G. W. Reed, Basil Elder, Robert Barry—but particularly from Mr. & Mrs. (Thos.) Meredith—the latter gave me Thirty Dollars.

On 2d Nov. returned to the Mtn. Sang High-Mass (Pontifical) and preached, the Sunday fol. In Town & at St. Joseph's the two ensuing days—Tho employed in administering last Sacraments to Mrs. Brookes and interring her. Left on Thursday and pd. 100 Doll. for Stage from Frederick (where Revd. Mr. McElroy & the French Ladies were (as usual) very Hospitable in receiving us—) to Wheeling. Arrived in Wheeling after two accidents which might have proved dangerous, but did not—thanks to kind Angels—on Sund. morn. at 5 oClock. Found Mr. Hoerner at his Hotel. Heard the Sisters' Confessions—Alphonsa & Cephas. Said Mass & preached—preached again, by special request, in the evening after supper—Nearly all present Protestants; Mr. Pentoney, to whom I had a letter from F. Elder, was very civil—invited us to his house to tea and hired a carriage at his own expense to fetch Bisp. David and Mr. Ellery (Bardstown lay brother) from Mrs. Thomson's, 3 miles from Wheeling, where they staid, and where they could get no wine either Sunday or Monday Morn. to say Mass. Mrs. Moore & her sister, Miss McGovern (since married to Mr. Zave) made us put up at their house.—I mean Mr. Young (Revd. Provincial of the Dominicans) and myself—the young men, Messrs. OMealy & OLaughlin & James McCallion, who came with me from Emmitsburg, put up at Mr. Hoerner's Hotel. The Sisters & little Willy Ryan went to good Mrs. Magruder's, formerly of Frederick. Miss Ann Marr, who came likewise from Emmitsburg, as My Housekeeper, staid with them. On Mond. at 2 P. M. we came down the River in the Steam-Boat—*Emigrant*—Pd., as well as I rem. 8 Doll. a head. Arrived at Cincinnati, on Thursday, 14th Nov. at 10 A. M. Went to the house of Mr. Santiago, opposite to the Church—There dressed in *Pontificalibus*—The clergy came to receive me—Went in procession to the Church—Was addressed by Venerable Bishop Flaget—Bp. David present—Chaunted the prayers prescribed in the Pontifical and observed all the other ceremonies—See "Telegraph" for this day & fol. Sunday—

Had many arduous duties to perform, tho' frequently interrupted by kind children coming to visit their new and long looked for Spiritual Father—Arranging the preliminaries for the transfer of the property of the late Bishop, Rt. Revd. Dr. Edd. Fenwick—The Executors were Very Revd. Dr. Resé, Very Revd. Nicholas Young (the Bishop's nephew) and Revd. Anthony Ganilh, a French Priest. The last mentioned gentleman induced the late Bishop to make a new will, which he, (Ganilh) drew up, setting aside one made by Lawyer Storer! and all that said Ganilh may shew his knowledge, or rather his most fatal ignorance of the Law and he appointed one of the administrators. Ganilh did not come to Cti. knowing how anxious I must have felt to have the estate settled up, he still remained at Bardstown where he teaches in the college. My Lawyer advised me to go to him & insist on having all the papers, bonds, notes deeds, mortgages which he most unwarrantably abstracted from the State and Diocese.—The journey was dull & the weather very cold—I got the rheumatism

in my back from cold—The covering of the beds in the St. Boat being very narrow. Revd. Mr. Abell rode with me from Louisville to Bardstown—40 miles through snow & mire—I rode an Indian Poney—Mr. Young another, both belonging to Mr. Byrne of Louisville, whose Father, one brother and one Sister live in Cti. We put up with him—His Lady is very obliging, altho' a Protestant. In L. I was happy to meet Hannah Downing of Mallow—staying at Mr. Haynes of Doneraile. On the Road from L. to B. we slept at a Tavern where two Travelers rising at Midnight, took our saddlebags, containing my cassock, breviary &c—and Mr. Young's who had these affairs under his charge—We had to send after them & in about 6 days recovered our property. The crossing of creeks is serious business on these bad roads—they are now McAdamising them—The appearance of Kentucky is real negro—the difference in so short a distance between it & the well settled parts of Ohio is immense. I staid but a very short time at Bardst—15 hours—had to argue Mr. Ganilh into a surrender of the Muniments. Visited Nazareth—and Revd. Mr. Reynolds & Deluynes, Supr. & Confessor of the Good Sisters. Made the whole journey back next day—Mr. Young was fatigued enough to give up the ghost but we kept at it & recruited quickly before the blazing hearth of Mr. Byrne. There was a benefit at the L. Theatre for the Orphan-Asylum, at this time.

Arrived at Cincinnati, without breaking my fast at 1 P. M. on 1st Sunday of Advent—Said Mass—The Past. Letter of the Bishops was read today—fol. Sunday, mine was read—Sunday after that, I preached a Charity Sermon. It was the highest amount that had ever been recd. on any such occasion in the church—It was merely a compliment to the new Bishop—My sermon I borrowed up & down—and might well say "Non Nobis Dne." I attended an anniversary meeting of the Ohio Lit. Soc. this week, by special invitatn. and under a broad sign of the Cross said a prayer &c.

The Exercises of the Jubilee, which finished on the 2d Sunday of Advent, were well attended. There must have been, at least, 600 Cts. It is to be celebrated throughout the diocese, in any three consecutive weeks, the various Pastors may see best to designate, according to the occupations or leisure of their respective flocks, from the 1st of Jan. to the 1st. of July, 1834.

For departure of Bp. Rese, see Telegraph of this date. I had to give him my note for upwards of 500 Doll. to meet the demands of Grocers, Dry Goods men, &c. &c. for value recd. by the inmates of the Coll. & Sem. before my arrival! Thousands upon thousands of Dollars had been expended on buildings which are ill-constructed & inconvenient, of wretched materials, half-finished, leaking, mill-dewed roofs & walls; floors loose & badly laid, hydrants left insecure against external injury—property not enclosed & people stealing our wood & coal—House full of filth—Meals ill-cooked & most ungainly & uncleanly servants. The Priests of the Sem. its Presidents! B. O. C. (Bernard O'Cavanaugh) took the young Seminarians to *Whiskey shops* & to *the Theatre*. Came home drunk at midnight, as Ven. Bishop David beheld with horror, with his own eyes—another Presid. of Sem. J. V. W. (Joseph Vincent Wiseman) had the boys of the street at his heels, shouting after him as he reeled drunk thro' the streets. These are awful lessons for the Bishop charged to educate a pure &

blameless Priesthood, not to entrust their formation to every sacerdotal virtue & usefulness, to men whom it wd. have been better, as the Saviour said, never to have been born, or to be cast with the Millstone of scandal around their necks into the sea, not deep enough to hide their shame—to purify their iniquities. One of these Seminarians, no wonder, under such guides & in full view of such enormities, provoked a boy, sent to learn printing first, in the Telegraph office, to defray by his labor part of the expense of his future Eccles. instruction and then join the Sem. Such the pious wish of exemplary Parents—to draw a knife upon him & wound him in two places in the public refectory!—This was some months before my arrival—Bp. Rese, then Vic. Gen. excommunicated the boy & still left him among the rest of the occupants of the Athenaeum, at meals, prayers, &c. &c.!!!

As this is for my own and my successor's direction, I think proper to insert the names—Daugherty was the name of the Seminarian—Philips of the boy. Daugherty was grossly ignorant and I wd not re-admit him—he had left & gone to Mr. Consedine's—a little out of town, before I came hither. Philips I permit to stay, for a longer trial.

B. O. C. having been suspended by Dr. Resé, remained a short time at Revd. Mr. Reid's, St. Martin's Church, Browne County, Ohio, where he was when the suspension was handed to him by Revd. Mr. Thienpont. Revd. Mr. Reid knew that Revd. Mr. O. C. had made himself liable to Suspension—that the measure was actually in contemplation, yet he left him in care of his congregn. & infant Sem. of St. James (consisting of 9 or ten scholars—and proceeded to New Orleans, without my leave, altho I was daily expected in Cini—The Council having terminated some time previously, B. O. C. had to leave St. Martin's & returned to Cinci. applied to me for faculties which I refused—He stays at Mr. Downey's, Merchant—A melancholy ruin.

The opening of a school at St. James' was altogether premature. There are 3000 acres belonging to the Bishop, 50 of which are cleared and under fence. The country around is very healthy—altho' in winter the road, except from Cini. to Milford, is truly vile—The place is now resorted to, as likely to prove an interesting Catholic settlement, by numerous Catholic families—Irish, German, French—The Protestant Americans are leaving the neighbourhood chiefly, it is presumed, owing to the great influx of Roman Catholics. The best of the nascent Congn. I believe to be—Mr. John Gross, formerly of Conawago—Married to an Irish Lady—he is a shoe maker—has a son learning the Printing in Cti. He lives in Fayetteville, nearly three miles from St. Martin's Church. In same village Mr. and Mrs. McGroarty—two brothers & two Wives—Mr. & Mrs. Nead—very worthy people—Nearer the Church—Mr. & Mrs. Scanlon—Mr. and Mrs. Boyle, old Mr. Bamber—an English-Man who has had quarrels with Revd. Mr. Reid (who is said by all his flock to have the fashion of denouncing them for their real or supposed faults, too plainly, from the altar—Bamber Sen. when he drinks rides thro' the Village of Fayetteville, cursing the Irish. His two sons and two daughters-in-law are said to be better Catholics. Mr. & Mrs. McKittrick & family are—So So Catholics—the old people, well meaning I imagine—Mr. & Mrs. Kelly, young married couple,

attentive to their duty—they, Mr. & Mrs. O'Connor, Monsieur Conrard & family, all good, live on the road before you reach F. Ville. Mrs. Savage, a most excellent American Lady, with her husband, lives near the Church of St.M. Jacquot, Mellard—are two French families—good—22 Miles from here, (Cini.) on the road to F. Ville, are several Catholic families—French Germans from Nancy & Strasbourg—and Irish—There are many also—5 miles nearer this side, at *Perrins Mills.* Mr. Owens (an Irishman) and his wife, an American lady, live at the X roads. I visited them on St. John's Day and told the man to prepare and renew his Com. on the 2nd of Jan. 1834, when I wd call again on my return from St. Martin's, which Congregation I thought it my duty to visit, in order to afford its long desolate members (Mr. Reid not having returned from his unauthorised excursion) the oppty. of complying with their religious duties at this Holy season. I was accompanied by Revd. Mr. Deloughery—I staid until after Din. on New Year's Day, at St. M. where I preached twice and in the interval between the two festivals—Sunday & New Year,—visited many of the Cath. around. This may be made a most fervent missionary station—People simple & full of Faith. Yet scandals have begun here, in the Sanctuary & near it. Mr. Reid's *brother* has been accused of too much familiarity with a servant maid, of whom I was shocked to find no fewer than three of inexperienced youth here—from 16 to 20. These abandoned among scholars, workmen, &c, &c.

On 2d. Jan. Mr. Owens went to Holy Com. His wife, only baptized, was afraid she was not prepared to go to confession—otherwise polite & clever.—No charge made here for selves or horses—Will make this home a station.

Coming home, weather bitterly cold. My horse fell under me on the Ice—I had before fallen from him by his starting when I had only one foot in the stirrup. Kind G. Angels nigh "ne offendam versus lapidem" I have great faith in Angels' care & say daily "Angele Dei" &c.—on my return had letters from Mt. St. Mary's from Miss Ogier, &c. &c.—Miss Ogier wishing me to pray for the resurrection of her most amiable nephew, John Louis Ogier, from the grave!—This fine boy died in conseqce of a strain & interior injury from a leap down the stone steps, near the Wash-house at Mt. St. Mary's.

Epiphany.—Preached today to a thin congregation—Holidays not well kept here. John Carroll Wheland, Joseph Fry, John McNeal, Farrell Reily, Vincent Spalding, two Melines, Dr. Auth. Hermange—been to see me since I have been in Cti. All Mountain students. I gave art. headed Epiphany & Brother Edward's Poetry headed "The Lord is My Light &c. for Telegraph—Piece headed Xmas also mine (a previous paper contained letter of Mt. St. M. students & my answer.)

On Epiphany Evening, a project of constitution for the "St. Benevolent Society for the support & instruction of destitute orphans" was submitted to a meeting convened in the Athenaeum & the same after due exam. approved. Vid. Telegr. of this date. Mr. Cassilly (M. P. Esq.) who had expressed to the late Bishop, & many others, an intention to purchase & make a present of a suitable house for an Orphan Asylum, was so much offended at his donations being published prematurely in the Cath. Papers that he withdrew the grant

and instituted, before my arrival, a suit, and menaced to dispossess the Sisters.

Jan. 6.

His language has been, frequently indecorous in speaking of them & of the Revd. I. J. Mullon. The wife of Mr. Cassilly is a bigoted and bitter Protestant & she has worried him and put him to great and unnecessary expense, reproaching him with reluctantly granting her articles of costly dress &c. while he cd afford to squander 5000 Doll. on Lazy nuns. He has the pusillanimity to bear with such insults and to insist, moreover on having back the house & lot occupied by the Sisters—they are in Sycamore St., at least, two squares from the Church. Guided by the conduct of St. Aug. on a nearly similar occasion, vid. his life by Appolonius, I prefer to tell him to take his house—the God of the orphans will find them a home. He has strong faith—comes regularly to church, sincerely intends, I believe, to do something generous for the distressed—but he is persecuted at home. I have made up my mind not to quarrel with him, nor with anyone. Servum Dei non oportet litigare. It is true that the Directors of the U. S. Bank in this City gave him the property 500 Doll. cheaper than they wd have let him have it, if he had not protested that he bought for the Orphans. But let the Sisters leave the house, not charged with rent for the last 4 years and I am satisfied.

Jan. 7.

A Bricklayer, employed by Revd. James Reid, to build the new house at St. Martin's Browne Cty. is in town waiting for payment of his bill. Having no money & not knowing the nature of his contract with that clergyman, I cannot advance him funds—To get him away from Brown Cty. & enable him, as he seemed then anxious to go home, I gave him, when I was up there, at New Year, ten Doll. He stays here and talks imprudently and continually of the Priest—Bishop too very probably. He is of no religion, altho' he professed over-and-over to me at Mrs. Savage's that he & his wife—living in Maysville wanted very much to join the R. Cath. Ch. The imprudence of Revd. Mr. Reid in employing such men & leaving them unpaid & without definite instructions, is inconceivable.

Jan. 12.

Rev. Mr. Mullon preached on the Epistle—I wish his sermons more connected & better prepared—facility alone will not do. In the evening, he gave an instruction on the 1st Com. respect pd to Saints, &c.—rather not argumentative—and too many hard truths and opprobrious epithets & odious comparisons to Protestants.

Call to orders.

In the evening, Rev. Messrs. Mullon, Deloughery and Thienpont met, at my request, in my room, to give me their conscientious opinion of the candidates of the Seminary, aspirants to the Holy Priesthood. (The Seminary is composed of the Following Members—M. M. Junker of Nancy (Diocese of) France—Conlan, Dillon, O'Mealy, O'Laughlin, *Allwill* (whom I refused to receive some years ago at Emmittsburg, and whom I will not suffer to remain here) Würtz, Mullon, McCallion, Young, Americus Warden—of these, Young, Mullon & War-

den are Americans & least advanced, except McCallion, in their education—Conlan, Dillon & Allwill have recd Minor orders.)

After the invocation of the Holy Ghost & a warning of the responsibility under which they were placed—the conseqces to the Church, to Souls, to themselves of the result of such deliberations—*The Manus Nemini Cito imposueris* indirectly addressed to them, as it more directly was to Bishops (nos posuit Sp. *Stus.* &c. The following gentlemen were approved as per report. "Though Mr. Junker has not yet gone through a regular course of Theolog. studies, yet the situation of the German Congregation seems to require his advancement to the Priesthood. All concurred in testimony of his exemplary piety & excellent conduct.

Mr. Conlan was next approved for Subdeaconship—The same creditable testimony to his uniform piety and correct deportment was likewise rendered by all present.

Mr. Dillon was put off, for at least, one year, as he has been frequently seen overcome with liquor, had gone into the City with Revd. Mr. Cavanaugh, without leave & had given impertinent language to Revd. M. M. Mullon & others. I doubt very much whether I shall ever allow him to receive Holy Orders. He seems to me conceited & vain. Mr. O'Mealy was called to receive the Tonsure. 22d, 23d, Feb. 13th March 16th &c. were the days selected for the conferring of these orders &c.. .. .. (indistinct)

13th Jan.

Mr. Dillon was very humble & willingly acknowledged the propriety of the course pursued in his regard. The others have signified to the Revd. Mast. Cerem. their submission & acquiescence in the views of their Eccles. Superiors. . . . This day I recd. a Letter from the ArchB. informing me that Revd. Messrs. Pise & Wainwright had obtained their exeats, the former receiving a salary from the Bishop of New York for conducting his Nyack College—the latter stationed at Pottsville, Pa.

Jan. 14.

This day Mr. Storer, our Lawyer, informed me that in order to remedy the numerous defects in the late Bishop's will, occasioned by Revd. Auth. Ganilh, it will be necessary to write to everyone of the heirs of Dr. Fenwick and obtain from each a release! This will be troublesome business indeed! God is All.

15

Began a few articles for the Telegraph—"*What is Truth.*" The Ohio which was nearly frozen over the other day, is said to have risen since yesterday Morn. nearly 20 feet—Sent Revd. Mr. Abell of Louisville 4 Doz. Catechisms & a roll of pictures today by Mr. Bulger, brother of deceased Priest of Morgan buried at Mt. St. M.

16.

Mrs. Williamson, mother of Adolphus, has presented the church a Com. Cloth which extends along the Rails of the Sanctuary—an Altar Cloth—and bought Stuff for a few Surplices for the Seminarians. Dined at Mr. O'Hara's today. The City Clerk paid me today, in Script, as they term it, 221 Doll

instead of 260 due for the Engine House rent for one year. 15 per cent was charged for cashing his order—The corporation being deeply in debt & forbidden to take up more money on interest to pay the same!!!

17.

Two Seminarians, Patrick Rattigan & Langton, who had applied to me some years before for admission at Emburg, have just left the Sem. of the Barrens Missi. when their health was bad and apply again to me for adoption into this diocese. Have no means of support for them. Of 28 Seminarians last year at the Barrens, they say 22 have left it, mainly in conseqce of its being so unhealthy.

18.

It has been determined that Revd. Mr. Mullon go to New Orleans to prepare the ground for obtaining more scholars for the Athen, more subscribers for the Telegraph, coffee & sugar for the Orphans, and to see what Revd. James Reid is doing there—what money he has collected for his new school and church in Browne County which he has so indecently abandoned—This day I resolved that Kavanagh & his wife—a Widower & Widow lately married by a Squire, because I wd not let them be married without publication of Bans, or at least, a few days' previous notice of their intention, shd. come before the altar at 8 o'clock Mass, receive a reprimand & ask pardon of Alm. God & the Congn.—they agreed penitently and humbly. Revd. Mr. Mullon will carry the com. into effect tomorrow Morning.

19.

Published at High Mass that the Law of the Church requiring publication of the Bans between Parties intending to contract Marriage cannot be dispensed with when the Parties are unknown to the Pastors of the Cathedral &c. &c. See Telegraph of this time.

20.

Heard of dissatisfaction at Mt. St. M. news in a Letter from John Matthias to F. Meline—F. Meline & Mr. Mullon go to New Orleans in Mr. Byrne's boat, the *Hudson*, now in Louisville—Revd. Mr. M. starts from here in the *Michigan* to take the *Hudson* at L. Snow falling fast—River high & rapid.

21.

Servants leave at too short warning—High-minded here—Must have some from Emburg—told Miss Ann she May write for Betsy Bigha who is very anxious to come out—

22.

Wrote to Dr. I. Cook Bennett of Bloomfield who is, he says, anxious to embrace catholicity & devote his life to the preaching of the Gospel—Is a Married Man & has one Child— Female Elders & Tract—distributing sybils very busy in preventing the spread of popery in Cti. Think this place one of the Pope's strong castles. . . .

23.

Mr. Reids Bricklayer, Fawble, speaking ill of me thro Town. . . Revd.

Mr. O'Canagh at the Theatre again! . . . Invited to attend the Dedication of the new Church in Pittsburg, in next April.

24.

Bigots growing fierce in their opposition to Popery—Brownler's Letter to the R. C. Bishops of the U. States! Cin. Journal—Why do not Catholics awake?—Such apathy in the ranks of our own Clergy is inconceivable—I know that prayer & Study & visiting the Sick is more meritorious and Commendable, but we must descend sometimes into the Plain & fight the Philistines with their own arms. The Henenanns, celebrated Musicians & Vocalists, in Town. probably will come to our church tomorrow—It is snowing hard.

25.

Visiting sick Miss Swift—receiving Letters & ans. have to teach Theol. & Philos. class in absence of Revd. Mr. Mullon. Will commence a Script class on Thursday, God willing. Understand that Dr. John C. Bennett with whom I have just been corresponding on the subject of Religion is a Bishop of the Methodist Sect. Politely invited to go see the picture of Temptation and expulsion of Adam & Eve now being exhibited in Cti.: am tempted myself to think it is all a hoax. heard from Emburgh.

26.

Began a course of instructions on the Decalogue. An unfortunate Irishman, crazy & what is worse drunk, as I fear, hallowed out in Church "& Martin Luther"—I "never minded him," until all was over.

27.

St. Mary's Seminary, Wash Cty., Ky., burned on the 3th Dec. 1833. this was the 4th time similar disasters occurred there!

Jan. 28th.

Writing a series of Articles "Fifty reasons 22." this vile tract has been taken to Mrs. Johnson & put in the hands of a good convert on Sunday as he left our church.

29.

Said Mass for Visitation Order. reminded of the day when I said Mass, in the Vestments of St. F. de Sales & the Nuns of Rue Neuve St. Etienne went to Com. Privileged & happy day! May I never forget the resolutions with which it then pleased God to inspire me. . . . Circus and 5 other Houses in this city & street, burned last night. Letters from Revd. E. Collins—doing well up at Dayton & Stollardstown. God prosper his Servant.

30.

Gave Revd. D. Deloughery a cloths press of which his room was destitute—had a few days before given Revd. Em. Thienpont a similar piece of furniture. . . . Heard shocking tales of Revd. Mr. Reid when he was in Brown City. Cannot credit them. He has not yet returned. . . . Gave F. Meline 5 Dollars more. He has been detained in Town—The *Hudson* was crippled, on her way from N. Orleans—Revd. Mr. Mullon was to have left Louisville on Monday, in the *Louisa*.—Florant goes in the *Superior* from this place, this evening.

31.

Recd a Villainous Letter against Mr. Collins from a German—John Biekey, of Dayton. Sent him a suitable reply— a little child, Eliza M. Kramer, bound to me, at request of the Sisters—She is a *Methodist* as far as She knows—Amusing form of indenture. She is like Helen Pike. Mrs. McDermott's daughter who says she was Married by a Squire at Louisville to Bishop a Notorious Gambler and profligate, came to see me—Is tormented at the idea of her connexion with an *Infidel* who mocks at all religion & who regards no moral restraints—he has been divorced in New York, or Connecticut & is said publicly thro' this City to have had several children by different Women. (This girl's Mother is excessively ignorant—She lately did public penance for having got married by a squire, after I had refused to perform the ceremony in advent. She is a grand Mother & her husband is a —— & surely a simple Irishman.) *Mrs.* Bishop is looked upon by the people around as a kept *Mistress.*

Feb. 1.

Having some doubts of the correctness of a copy furnished from the Register's off. of the late Bishop's Will, I examined the record and found it is far from being as bad as I thought—the copy was, in fact, incorrect—for household's lots—it reads "houses and lots". This is a reprief——Mr. Storer is of his old Mind.

2d.

Preached before Mass on the blessing of the Candles and Presentation of our Lord. after Gospel, on the propriety of Subscribing for the Telegraph—abuse of Prot. Journals &c. &c.—and then on the *Word of God* at the usual time. Great distress in Town—Money brings 3 per cent, per Month—

3d.

Have many letters to write today—Schenhenss, N. D. Young, Bruté.

4.

Mother Rose, &c. &c. Mr (Vogeler Revd) is much to be pitied—He is subject to Most distressing Hallucinations. thinks the house shaky, the cook will poison him &c. I wish I cd. do something for So good a Man. 16 new Subscribers for Telegraph—I write "Spirit of Cti Journal."

Feb. 5.

Employed in looking for a house for the Sisters— will try and obtain one in *6th St.* It is offered at 4000 Dollars & is more convenient in every way, than the house of *Athens* in *5th* beyond the Market, which I went to see with Dr. Marshall—and for which 300 Doll. rent were asked—

6.

Taught a Scripture class today—will continue, please God, to do so—

7 & 8.

Mr. Henni of Canton asks leave to go to Europe—

9.

Mr. Ch. P. Montgomery asks direction as to interment of Non-Conformists with the Law of Pasch-Com. & the duties of Religion, in Catholic graveyards—and circumstances here will not admit of our strictly enforcing the dec. of W. C.

of La. When *they called for a Priest*, let them be considered to have died in good dispositions & obtain Ch. burial. Publish Pastoral for Lent.

10.

Writing "Plain Reasons" & Conclusion of 'what is truth'?

11.

Revd. Mr. OCavanagh has left Town at length—Seemed to have no thought of repentance. His brother and Sister remain here—

12.

Preached at Blessed Ashes' distribution—Early hour—7,—get a considerable crowd. . . .Instructing Mrs. Farman and Mrs. Delaplaine, at Mrs. Jaffs. Invited by Mr. McHenry & Misses Reilly to spend last Even. did not go—

13.

Script. class.

14.

Letter from Revd. Mr. Reid—Says he has just recd. My Letter— has about 1000 Doll. and will come back instanter. His printed french circular as curious a Specimen as his English one—

15.

Still busy in looking for a house for the Sisters—so hard to Suit them— There are Sundry Judgements on Dr. Gano's property in 6th St. which if I can get with a good tittle & for tolerable terms at this most depressed time, I will take. The Sisters could have their School in a House, the 'female Sem' lately kept by Mrs. Talent—and keep the orphans Separate from the others.

16.

Preached on Justice of God—as usual, left out Much—Mr. Rives & family in Church—Congn. very orderly—Spoke also of Catechism—in the Evening lectured on 1st Com. Suming up —and began the 2d.

17.

Went over to Mr. Bullocks'—a Visit to this enlightened Most plain good sense Englishman is always interesting & instructive—He was personally acquainted with Sturbide—Lord Clifford, Lady Blessington & all the first Men of the British Empire.

18.

Last night at 10½ had to go for Dr. Hermange for Sister Victoria who was taken suddenly sick—She ought to be sent home— It is thought she is imprudent in diet &c.—

19.

I have this day Signed an agreement with Dr. Gano to pay him for his house in 6th St., 1000 Doll. in 14 days, 1500 in 6 months & 1500 in 12 months from Day of Sale—

Feb. 20.

Many now, and especially Cassilly himself, telling me I cd. get property much cheaper—perhaps so—but why did he, unhappy man, place me under

the necessity of Making such a bargain—why retract a gift? and threaten repeatedly and insultingly to turn Sisters & orphans out of doors?

20.

This day I had to reprimand V. before B. & Alpha. for having indulged to excess in a way to disgrace—a Lay girl observed it—I dined today at old Mr. Consedine's—Mr. (Dr.) Hermange accompanied me in a pleasant ramble, praying his expected son may one day be a Priest.—

21st.

Warm weather—Visit from Joseph Elder of Balte.

22d.

Tonsured Mr. Henry D. Juncker & Joseph OMealy—gave the instruction (at 7 oclock low Mass.) Conferred Minor Orders on Mr. Juncker—Mr. Montgomery arrived from New Orleans—left Mr. Reid at Louisville. Brought letters from Revd. Mr. Mullon who says Very Revd. Mr. LeBlanc will write to Me of Revd. Mr. Reid's conduct down there.

23.

Mr. Reid arrived. Mr. Blanc has written to me and said little against Mr. Reid—Mr. R.'s Agent, Hogan, of New Orleans, has written after throwing up his agency & recalling his Son. I have had a Most serious talk with him on all charges against him—My plans & Views conc. Brown County &c. and agreed to let him return thither to see how he will get on now. In New Orleans Revd. Mr. S. H. Motgy tells me Mr. Reid was not charged with any crime; but that he talked pompously to low people.

24.

Subdeaconship to M. M. Juncker & Conlan. I have resolved, all things considered, to keep Mr. Mtgomery in this house, where he is desirous, rather than willing to reside. He has been accused, justly or unjustly, of being too familiar with three Ladies (Mrs. D. Miss Talleton & Mrs. —— formerly Miss Baker—I believe him not guilty of More than indiscretion in these instances. His orders & He do not agree. He complains that he was not suffered to see the constitutions, when urged to take his Vows; that after 10 years he accidentally read and protested against them in their application to himself. that he was never happy in the Comty and that Bp. Rosati has written to Rome for an Act of Secularization for him. He is very popular, instructs well—is a good financier and has made many converts & built several Churches. It is a good pple to *gather* rather than *Scatter* resources— Writing for Telegraph—Leopoldine Association—50 reasons —&c. Letters; Classes—&c.—

25.

Sudden cold—Went with Revd. E. Deloughery to see Sus. Mullon who has the bilious fevre at Mrs. Harris Hotel—heard she was better . . .

26.

Birthday. 34 years! J. M. J.

Feb. 27.

May I begin a new life of fervor and holiness, O My God—and do Thou enable

me to put an end to the distracted and wretched coldness of the State in which I have lived since I have been a Bishop. Gave 5 Doll. for a Brev. for Mr. Conlan. Resolved to ordain Mr. Juncker Deacon at the German Service, 4th Sunday of Lent.

28.

How many who should be Catholics, live in forgetfulness of God, or enticed away by heresy! So many little Children too who are perverted in conseqce of their parents' sending them to Presbyterian Schools. Must have a Male free School & go about more among the Catholics who stray from their Church—

March 1st.

Very cold—Visited the property on the hill—see it a Waste—only one or two Gallons of milk per day, pd. for that fine property & no pains taken with it. Must get another tenant than this poor Dutch family— Mr. Motgmy. went with me to see it. We agreed on the way, after much previous conversation, to undertake the Building of a German Church. Letters from Mr. Jamison—transferred to Mt. St. M!

March 2d.

Mr. Thienpont preached a good sermon today on Sin—Mr. Mtgy sang high Mass—took cup of tea at Mr. McHenry's in the Evening. Wish McHenry was a practical Catholic.

March 3d.

Heard from Emburg—"Il a passé bien de l'eau sous le pont," says good Mr. Bruté—Mr. Jamison has *given up*—Mr. Butler is now President and joint owner with Messrs Whelan & Sourin!—God prosper his Holy Cause, whomsoever He deigns to call to its defence. refer to letters of this Epoch.

4th.

Gen. Finley, Carneal, Dr. Drake coming in to see & exchange friendly assurances—Resolved to ordain Mr. Juncker Deacon at the German Service next

5.

Sunday—Letters from St. Joseph's directing Sr. Victoria to go to St. Louis by 1st oppty.

6.

Walked about Town with Mr. Mtgomery, looking for a convenient Site for a New Ger. Church—Have partly concluded that it shall be 120 by 60 feet. Hope to get ground at from 20 to 30$ per foot.

7.

Dr. Gano's property is so much encumbered with a Mortgage & Judgements to the Amount of upwards of 3000 Doll. that I shall not pay him a cent until All is clear.

8.

Writing a notice & remarks on Bishop Dubois' Pastoral—It is certainly a Most Singular production. We leave out what cd not by sound hearts or Minds be read with pleasure.

9.

Lent Mr. Maurice Byrne 500 Doll. to help him out of his Share of the public embarrassment, until Tuesday. Dr. Gano finds it, I imagine, as much as he can do to get a release of the Judgements on his property. . . . got a Kind of chill today in little chapel—

March 9.

The Wall of the ditch around these premises fell in last night, loosened by the rain—it was wretchedly built—Mr. White should certainly pay for its repairs —75 Doll.—Gave Ann Knott 4 Doll.

10.

Ordained Mr. Juncker Deacon at the Ger. Service today—Mr. Vogeler preached. I lectured in the evening on Vows—reconnoitred ground for Germ. Church—They ask 75 Doll. per foot, for a fine lot 120 feet deep & 60 wide, on 4th St. not far from the Unitarian Church—took tea at Mr. Sayre's—He, I hope, will soon be a Cath. & his Sister-in-Law, Mrs. Burnham.

11.

Rode around the hill today on a rough trotting Pony—was accompanied by Mr. Mtgy.—called at Mr. Consedine's who Daughter Honora has been ill. . . . What Multitudes of unfortunate Irish people Married by Squires &c. and to bigamists. it is truly awful.—

12.

Revd. Mr. Mullon has returned from N. Orleans and in excellent health. He has brought 650 Doll. of which Some is for the Price of Board and tuition of Students in the Athenoum; Some for the Telegraph Subscription & Some for the orphans. He brought me a set of Vestments from N. Orl. Sent from Belgium & some Theolog. books—also a Bologna ed. of Rom. Breviary sent me by My Kind friend Revd. Mr. Jean-Jean.

13.

Plenty of news from Emburgh about the change—Mr. Butler's presidency &c. &c.——Sr. Victoria gone—

14.

Happy to learn that Charles Carroll's heirs have agreed to refer their Scandalous litigation to Arbitrators, and that Revd. Messrs. OBrien To have been released from the odious obligation of giving testimony—

15.

Mr. Thienpont has bought a house—I promised to provide provender—Dr. Price has not yet noticed My Note concerning the removal of Ann, his Ward, from the Asylum—She is subject to fits and Must leave there. Revd. Mr. Collins here— I gave him—all I cd. afford—20 Doll. —to pay his expenses up & down to & from Dayton—

16.

Mr. Juncker ordained Priest—Mr. Mtgy. preached—He had to tell the people twice he was very sick and scarcely able to proceed—Bishop Flaget lately wrote to deprive him of faculties in Covington, after 31st March, if Mr.

Young did not agree to his living with me—It looks something as if there were pique, which perhaps, there is not, in this business. . . . We announced our determination to build a Germ. Church, today. Next week, I shall go round among the Germans, first, with Revd. Messrs. Vogeler and Mtgomery. God prosper the work for his own glory and our Salvation. Mr. Juncker gave Bened. with B. Sacrament—

17.

I preached the St. Patrick's Sermon to a full church at 11 oclock today—organ played, but Low Mass said by Revd. Mr. Mullon. All, thank God, passed quietly and orderly. Visiting Germans—Much pleased with them, so far.

18.

Subscribed 300 Doll. towards Germ. Church, Myself—Know not where I shall get them—Pd. Dr. John Gano 1000 Doll. on the Sisters' house—

19.

Wrote to Revd. Mr. Bruté to State my reasons why he shd. accept, if his Nomination by the Prov. Council, to the See of Vincennes, will be confirmed in Rome. The ArchBishop told him he was Nominated—Bishop Rosati informed Sr. Fanny that the ArchBishop is to have a Coadjutor!—I remember Bishop Fenwick observed in the Council "Let us Keep our own Secrets." Visited orphans today. they Sang "Holy Patron" and they have good right—

20.

Mrs. Dewitt has just heard from her brother Adolphus at the Propaganda. The Hoffmans of Balte. were in the Et. City when he wrote—No particular news. . . . Revd. Mr. Mullon having felt unhappy & looked so Since his return from N. Orl. has asked for his exeat, Stating as his reasons that his Sister (married) at Emburgh is in a state of beggary and Starvation; that Mrs. Harris, with whom his Sister now stays at the Broadway Hotel, is going to retire from it; as Mrs. Harris gives up the concern & that he Must therefore go to New Orl. where he can get a large Salary &c. &c. &c—This I cd not assent to—New Orleans is a Charnel-House—He might die there soon & then— Besides his real Motive, which I concluded is Mr. Mtgomery's living here, should not, any more than those I have stated, have any weight with a Priest. I refused the *exeat*— He acquiesced &c. &c—Mr. Darr, a Germ. in front Street, anxious to have a free Church, *i. e.*, No rented pews, but only a capitation cess for the support of priest & fabrique—could not consent to it—tho his Motives are good—He gave 50 Doll. for the erection of the Church as I wish it to be.

21.

Very cold today. Mr. Mtgomery an hour & ½ in crossing the River in Steam-ferry-boat. Wind high. River rising.

22.

Hearing confessions—cold—instructing converts—

23.

A French boy went to the railing of the Sanctuary today & recd Communion at Mr. Deloughery's Mass without having even been at confession. He thought

that what he did was going to Confession and that Communion was something else! O Jesu! O Potestas, O Patientia!!

March 23.

Had a meeting of the Germans today, who subscribed liberally towards the erection of the contemplated church—offered good brick at 2.62 & 2.68 per 1000, to be put in the wall at the rate of 2.62½ and the Mortar (no loom) & hands all furnished by bricklayer—

24.

Looking out for an eligible lot for a Germ. Church. There are two in Court St., one at 40 Doll. and the other at 45 D. a foot. one 160 feet deep—the other 130— and one on 4th St. 180 feet deep at 60 Doll. a foot.

25.

Preached today at last Mass which I said—Mrs. Hanley, our organist's little son is very sick—She cd not play—her husband is in New Orleans—

26.

Repository made of 4 upright posts *like a bed*—Must have the plan, if God spare my health & life, &c changed next year. Tenebrae sung tolerably well.

27. I sang High Mass. Mr. Mullon preached—No connexion in his sermons—left church at 2¼ P. M. Many of the female Communicants looked quite exhausted—

28.

Preached a quasi passion Sermon.

29.

Sang Mass—blessed font &c—Shall leave this to be done by a Priest next year

30.

Sang H. Mass. Mr. Mullon preached—tea at Dr. Bonner's.

31.

German Meeting during H. Mass.

April 1st.

I had agreed to take Stite's lot on Court St. at 40 Doll. a foot & ordered the deed to be made; but he cd not get a Mortgage released—Have now to look out elsewhere—

2d.

Went with M. Cassilly and Moreland to look at Brick—Agreed to take it 300,000, from Ackly, at 2.50 per 1000, and he to give 20,000 in—and take pay as he can get it—

3d.

Have given the Brick-work to Joseph Fry, who will furnish Mortar, no loom, as above—

4th.

Dined at Mr. Bullock's, with Mr. Mtgomery and Mr. Cappinger—See letter of Bishop Dubois.

5.

Confessions—looked at a lot belonging to Foot and Bonsel, in 5th St. not far from the Mound—May have to take 70 feet there by 200, at 3000 Doll. Its location is remote from most of the Germans—cd get a lot across the canal, for 25 Doll. a foot, but it is entirely too far away—

6th.

After the Benevolent Soc. Meeting, spoke of Subscription for the new church —Some little hesitancy on my part, as to the expediency & propriety of the Measure—The sum of 300 Doll. was subscribed by those present—

7.

Mr. Cassilly refused to Subscribe to the Church—and this man pretends to visit us and asks to go to confession—

8.

6 Sisters arrived with Dr. L. Smith on their way to N. Or. proceeded next day down the river. Lee Horsey Dead at Mt. St. Mary's.

9th.

I have written to Very Revd. W. McDonald of Kingston, N. C., to agree to his coming to live with us—He was the editor of the Catholic—an able paper—

10th.

Mr. Mullon still much discontented & as he has sent his Sister to Louisville, is anxious to follow her—talks very imprudently through town and too plainly shews his unreasonable dislike to Mr. Mtgomery—I have agreed to let him go if he persist in the same mind, at the end of June—We have closed the bargain with Foot and Bonsel. Mr. Thom. Reilly has declared himself unable to *Subscribe for the new church.* He has been very generous to the Sisters, to whom he gave, at one time, 200 Doll.

Bp. Rese' is expected here— Revd. Mr. Ganilh came to this City on H. Thursday & left it on Easter-Sunday, on his way to Louisville, without coming near the Church to *see God*, say Mass, or speak to me! Mr. Young seems offended at my taking Mr. Mtgy to live here. Mr. Vogeler, whose Mind has long been Vanishing, left us for New Orleans a few days ago & left poor Mr. Juncker responsibility & labors without end. Priests, Priests!

11th.

1836

April 26th, 1836.

After repeated efforts to procure a larger house, & more airy & healthy, for our Orphans, I closed a Contract with Mr. Cope, U. S. Bank Agent, for the large dwelling now occupied by Miss Beecher for a Boarding-School, and lot of 185 by 182 feet, for 15905 Dollars to be paid 1-5th in hand & the balance in four, equal, annual payments, with interest. There were 2370 dollars expended by the Bank on the repairs of the house last year. The title is said to be indisputable. Lawyer Chase would have purchased the property, so convinced was he of the soundness of the title, if he cd only be assured that he cd get the balance of the property immediately adjoining.

SEMINARY RECEIPTS

Jan. 1852.		
21.	Revd. Maurice Howard	10.00
22.	Miss Mary E. Butler	5.00
22.	Revd. Mr. Kearney (by my brother)	30.00
22.	Revd. Josue M. Young.	10.00
March 2d.	Very Revd. St. Th. Badin	10.00
Mch. 6th	Henry Schurbrock	5.00
Nov. 9	Revd. Mr. Kraemer (I handed this the 15th to Revd. Mr. Whelan)	5.00
1853	Mrs. Anna Corr (life subscriber annually)	10.00
Jan. 5th		
April 24	St. Xavier's for Sem. (by F. Driscoll)	155.00
October 26th 1852	Money for St. Joseph's Asylum recd. by me.	
Oct. 26	From P. Rogers & another by him	50.00
Nov. 14	Ambrose White (Baltimore)	4.00
" 15	Mary & Eliz. Van Aschen	2.00
Dec. 28th	Dr. John McMechan	7.00
1853		
Jan.	Spalding & Geraldine (given to Revd. Mr. Whelan)	50.00
Jan. 6th	a friend (Mrs. Maggini)	5.00
" "	Terence Duffy	1.00
	1853	
Mch. 22	Mrs. (other) Philips	3.00
24	Mr. Philip Gallagher	20.00
April 2	Miss Mary & E. Van Aschen	2.00
5	by Revd. Mr. Wood, Revd. Mr. Meyer of Dayton	5.00

BOOK REVIEWS

The Romance of Old Philadelphia. By John T. Faris, author of *Old Roads Out of Philadelphia*, joint author of *The Virgin Islands: Our New Possessions and the British Islands*. With frontispiece of color and 100 illustrations from original sources and photographs by Philip B. Wallace. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1918. Pp. 336. Price, $4.50 net.

Colonial Virginia, Its People and Customs. By Mary Newton Stanard, author of *The Dreamer—The Life-Story of Edgar Allen Poe* and *The Story of Bacon's Rebellion*. With 93 illustrations. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1917. Pp. 376.

"The genius of Romance has long since taken his hat," lamented the author of *Aguecheek* (now *My Unknown Chum*). He nevertheless mingled with his regret the consoling reflection that "it is a satisfaction to remember that such things were."

The things that were in Old Philadelphia form the topic-scheme of Mr. Faris's attractively illustrated book. His readers, unlike Aguecheek, will probably derive satisfaction from the realization that most of the things pictured by letterpress and illustration no longer are, although undoubtedly "such things were," in Philadelphia.

Even a cursory glance at the pages of *The Romance of Old Philadelphia* will serve to indicate to the reader that he has under his eyes not a history or even a story. The volume, covering the more than one hundred years that elapsed from the founding of Penn's green town to the close of the eighteenth century, is not technically a "romance." It is a series of unrelated chapters dealing with phases of life, social customs, mercantile peculiarities schools and schoolmasters, methods of travel, quaint postal facilities and the like, of the old city. Each chapter, however, pursues with a fair amount of chronological consecutiveness the topics it takes up for treatment. Thus we have accounts of the trials and hazards undergone by the early settlers in the ocean voyage from England to the sylvan paradise of Penn; the plans and methods of house-building and home-making; the beginnings of city government; glimpses of business life; social life and recreations; church customs; courtship and marriage, and the social

amenities surrounding these. Each of these topics has its own chapter.

Where in all this is the "romance"? Perhaps we shall dimly sense some of its glamour when we read of the cave-dwellings of a few poor settlers; of the unpaved streets and miry footpaths into which the hapless pedestrian sank angle-deep, or the dust-laden winds of the dry days—this latter atmospheric effect being, however, no exclusive possession of the olden city—humbling the head with dust and ashes. And when we further read of noisome alleys, hut-like grog shops, the midnight revelry of negroes, the rare visits of pirates, the occasional outfitting of privateers, perhaps we shall catch imaginative glimpses of the romance that characterizes Pierce Egan's stories of Old London or the more classical narratives of Harrison Ainsworth. Meanwhile we must remember that Mr. Faris's book does not pretend to be a story or a collection of stories. It is historical writing, but what we get is not a narrative but a collection of *genre* pictures.

Let us look at one of the pictures: "Many of the first colonists were compelled to put up with rude cave houses, built in the sloping ground above the Delaware. . . . A bank formed the back of the house, while timbers were driven into the ground for the sides and the front. Earth was heaped against the side timbers, a door and a window or two were cut, and a roof of timbers covered with earth completed the whole. The window-aperture contained a sliding board which, when closed, shut out some of the cold as well as the light. Sometimes a bladder or isinglass was stretched across. Those who were able to display a small paned window were proud of the achievement and were looked on with envy by their neighbors" (p. 47).

We look back with (present) satisfaction at the things that *were*. As to the streets, we find Benjamin Franklin noting in his autobiography that "our city . . . had the disgrace of suffering those streets to remain long unpaved, and in wet weather the wheels of heavy carriages plowed them into a quagmire, so that it was difficult to cross them; and in dry weather the dust was offensive" (*The Romance*, p. 142). Things were in bad shape in some of the streets down to the close of the eighteenth century, and to this cause were attributed the many scourges of smallpox and fever, the worst of the yellow-fever visitations occurring in

1793 and 1798. Perhaps Gertrude Atherton was not drawing upon her imagination when she described Chestnut Street, in the days of the Continental Congress: "It was a brilliant winter's day; drifts of snow hid the dead animals and the garbage in the streets; and all the world was out for Christmas shopping" (*The Conqueror*, p. 394). The yellow-fever followed hard upon this condition; Alexander Hamilton was stricken with the plague: "To the ordinary odors of carcasses and garbage were added those of vinegar, tar, nitre, garlic, and gunpowder . . . and the city confessed itself helpless, although it cleaned the streets." Thus Mrs. Atherton (*op. cit.* p. 421), with doubtless too much of truth. We are accordingly inclined to disagree with the romantic reflections of our friend Aguecheek.

There is, of course, a brighter side to the picture of Old Philadelphia—say, rather, there are many brighter sides. The cave-dwellings were comparatively few, the mansions were many, in the closing years of the seventeenth century. It was not long before the streets, albeit miry or dusty as the weather varied, formed a checkerboard whose squares were lined with beautiful trees and dotted with substantial houses that screened pleasant gardens, while the marts of commerce flourished, Assembly balls herded their fastidious patrons, and dainty folk clad in rainbow fineries picked their dainty way through the mire to fashionable shops and elegant residences. Behind all this were the sober thought and the humdrum daily toil of thinkers and workers. And, after all, perhaps Ben Franklin's mind, practical and scientific in cast rather than artistic and poetical, was more offended by the mud than it was pleased by the greenery. Contemporaries do not perceive romantic elements in current events or any quaintness in the life into which they are born. A later generation may construe past conditions as quaint, and may throw around them the halo of romance. Perhaps this is the reason why an artist, Joseph Pennell, living a century after Franklin, found in his native town a rich source for illustrations of the quaint survivals of past days and could thus furnish Mrs. Pennell's *Our Philadelphia* with highly attractive sketches, happily marrying his pencil to her pen. Perhaps this is also the reason why, in a lecture delivered as recently as the month of March, 1919, he found much to condemn in the appearance of

his loved city: "This city, as Penn planned it," he is reported to have said, "was verdant and beautiful. Now it is the most defiled and filthiest place on the face of the earth. I remember that, when I was a boy, this city was full of little streams that looked pretty but smelled bad. The streams are gone, but the bad smell is still there, produced by the dirty streets full of motor oil and garbage. And nothing looks pretty. You are talking here about reconstructing France, but you haven't enough brains to build a gutter to keep the streets clean." So does the *laudator temporis acti* revel in recollections of the things that were pleasing and remembers not the things that were offensive. But while his audience would still preserve, doubtless, a bourgeois preference for paved streets and underground drainage, they should not forget that the Philadelphia assailed by Franklin for its mire and dust was not exceptional in its day. In her *Life of Lincoln*, Ida Tarbell says of the National Capital itself in the year 1848: "The streets were unpaved, and their dust in summer and mud in winter are celebrated in every record of the period."

It was not the intention of Mr. Faris to rehearse the oft-told tale of Philadelphia's wholly enviable progress and splendid eminence. His purpose evidently was to make the reader intimately familiar with the varied phases of life in the olden city, and his method consists principally in extracting most abundantly from diaries and letters, many of which are still in manuscript and unedited, of the people whose life he depicts. His bibliography of two pages is of itself a most informing exhibit that has its own touches af quaintness in the mere titles quoted. He refuses of set purpose to avail himself of the great treasury of facts, anecdotes, illustrations, collected by Watson for his *Annals*. Neither does he refer to Scharf and Westcott, the most laborious historians of the city. His volume is intended to be a chatty companion for our leisure hours, somewhat unmethodically entertaining; and it succeeds in presenting to the reader a fairly graphic portrayal of the people and the place wherein they dwelt.

The volume contains nothing that is of peculiar interest to Catholics, and it may fairly be pointed out that the writer missed not a little of real romance in omitting mention of "Old St. Joseph's," St. Mary's and Holy Trinity Church. The legend of Evangeline would have brightened pages which, despite their

alluring invitation held out in the word "romance," may prove quite dull reading, we fancy, to all but dyed-in-the-wool Philadelphians possessed of a peculiar turn for the "quaint" rather than the "romantic." For in truth the book deals with quaintness (which is, after all, a relative matter), and not with romance (which is a thing of universal appeal). As to the illustrations, all of them are good, and some of them (*e.g.*, pp. 174, 202, 231, 245, 278) are excellent.

As the book of Mr. Faris might with felicitous accuracy have exchanged the word "Romance" in its title for "Quaintness," so this latest volume from the historical pen of Mrs. Stanard might well have borne the title of *The Romance of Old Virginia*. For the story of the early colonization of that commonwealth abounds in exciting and colorful incidents with a background of highly varied pioneer activities. The contrasts in purpose, plan, personnel, and *matériel* between the settlements at Philadelphia and Jamestown are sharply distinctive. Quaintness (from the viewpoint of this twentieth century) may have characterized the early life of Philadelphia, but romance undoubtedly accompanied every step of the pioneers in Virginia. Penn's clarity of vision, honesty of purpose, and broad ideals of tolerance, combined with a high order of practical statesmanship, foretold an orderly, and therefore a sufficiently prosy, development of his province. His Green Town, founded on peaceful and honest principles, prospered peacefully and progressively without any well-nigh destructive or even gravely untoward crises. He made friends of the aborigines, paying them for the land which, by a legal fiction, was already his own. The mutual pact of good-will was not fortified with any oath—"the only treaty never sworn to and never broken." And so it happens that the early story of Philadelphia is fairly prosy. But the colonization of Virginia was a disorderly process, marked by lack of clear plan, of well-defined purpose, of practical foresight, of hardy and honest personnel, of a sense of tolerance, and largely of a sense even of the common decencies of life. Troubles with the Indian tribes were of course constant, rising at times to horrible massacres followed by still more horrible reprisals; and, mingled with the fevers native to the soil, there was the human fever for mythical stores of gold "a little further on" in the unexplored wilderness.

The disastrous communism of labor followed by the drastic individualism of a slightly later day furnish forth incidents for romantic treatment. Meanwhile, what imagination is not touched by the episodes connected with such names as those of Captain John Smith, Powhatan, Pocahontas, Rolfe? The story is sketched by Mrs. Stanard in her first two chapters (pp. 1–77).

The volumes of Mr. Faris and Mrs. Stanard agree in general plan. In both we find a fairly consecutive narrative of the beginnings, the story of Philadelphia by the former devoting thereto the first three chapters. The remaining chapters in either volume are not closely interrelated. Mrs. Stanard takes in succession these topics: household goods (furniture, plate); social life (the home, hospitality, festivities, gaming, taverns, fairs, etc.); courtship and marriage; dress and jewels; the intercourse between Virginia and England; the theater; outdoor sports; education (free schools, private schools, tutors, William and Mary College, studying abroad); books; music; pictures; religion; funeral customs. There is an index of 24 pages. The many illustrations are attractive and beautifully executed, and the book is a fine product of the publisher's art.

The two volumes we are reviewing will appeal almost exclusively, no doubt, to the interest of the localities severally covered by them. In their very nature they are peculiarly local, and insensibly (and mostly by indirection) will be eulogistic or apologetic in character. Accordingly the outlook may not always be as broad as "the general reader" might desire. Mrs. Stanard, for instance, begins her work with this statement: "Three hundred years ago, as every school child knows, European civilization was already comparatively ripe. . . . But America was still a wilderness—its only roads the trail of the Indian . . . its only sign of human habitation clusters of bark huts and such patches of corn, beans, and tobacco as savages were able to cultivate by scratching the ground with the most primitive implements of wood and stone." And so civilization began in "America" with the advent of the Jamestown pioneers. But "America" is rather a large term and inevitably makes us think of the Spanish colonizers, not to speak of the Portuguese and the French. Even "North America" would be too large a term. "The United States" would convey a still smaller territorial

picture to the mind and yet remain too large a term, for Florida and New Mexico would utter a historical protest. "The English Colonies" in America would be more satisfactory as a background of territory for the settlement at Jamestown and would remind the reader that the English were notably late and remiss in the colonization of "America." It may not be unwise to insist upon such elementary points of accuracy, in view of the fact that an official weekly of one of our universities recently made the foolish boast that its medical school was the first one organized in America. There was no apparent misunderstanding of the term "America," for when the present reviewer called the editor's attention to the fact that there were Spanish medical colleges in "America" nearly two centuries earlier than the one in question, the editor declared that he had consulted some of the professors in his medical school and that they considered the matter of priority doubtful!

Again, there is perhaps too much stress (for "the general reader") laid upon the "gentlemen" settlers at Jamestown in Mrs. Stanard's book. The word is, however, not hers, but that af contemporary records or chronicles, and Mrs. Stanard accordingly puts it, very properly, in quotation-marks. In view of the delicate character of the subject, the fifty long pages devoted to it seem almost to challenge the vitriolic rhetoric of those whose Northern sensibilities are irritated by any reference to the F. F. V.'s. Mrs. Stanard does not mention James Russell Lowell's classical analysis in *The Bigelow Papers* (Second Series, No. III), but nevertheless quotes from Governor Berkeley's *Discourse and View of Virginia* (1663): "Another great imputation lyes on the Country that none but those af the meanest quality and corruptest lives go thither. . . . But this is not all true, for men of as good families as any subjects in England have resided there . . .," and Berkeley goes on to mention some of these and to refer vaguely to "a hundred others, which I forbear to name." Upon this, Mrs. Stanard comments fairly enough: "There is no doubt that the 'imputation' referred to by Berkeley was long prevalent in England. It probably arose, in part, from the exportation of convicts, but chiefly from the infamous system of kidnapping so widely spread there" (p. 50).

The chapter on "Religion" (pp. 320–340) does not even men-

tion the word Catholic, although Colonial Virginia enacted special and very severe laws against Catholics. Quakers, Presbyterians, and "dissenters" in general receive fair notice. The author deems it "a subject of gratification to Virginians that, though there was in the colony much irritating and troublesome persecution in the way of fines, and some banishments and imprisonments, no one was ever put to death within its borders for either religious views or witchcraft, nor with the exception of some whippings—not many apparently—and where witchcraft was the charge, a few duckings, were such offenders made to submit to corporal punishment."

The author puts clearly, in her Preface, the purpose of a work such as she has undertaken: "How may we call to life the everyday men and women of other times, obtain glimpses of them in their homes, going about their business or pursuing pleasure, know them as they were known to their families and neighbors? Not by reading history. . . . A gossipy letter, though crumbling and yellow, telling what company the writer had for dinner and what there was to eat, the jokes that were cracked and healths drunk; a fragment of a diary giving the neighborhood news, the condition of the crops or the latest political excitement; a tailor's or a milliner's bill; a will; an inventory; a court record of a lawsuit or a trial, will make a bygone day more real than volumes of history." Virginia, she assures us, "is rich in this graphic kind of material," in spite of "the lamentable destruction of early records." For there still remain many colonial county records, collections of family papers, quaint newspapers and pamphlets, privately published and other somewhat (relatively) inaccessible books, and upon such scattered and fragmentary sources she has drawn to furnish forth a stately and carefully compiled volume.

HUGH T. HENRY, LITT.D.

De Geschiedenis Van Het Amerikannsche Volk. By Arthur Meijer. Bewerkt door. H. H. Langereis, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1915.

This small volume of two hundred pages is an attempt to interpret the History of the United States for the Holland people. The text is divided into twenty-eight short chapters

that give not only a chronicle of political and military events, but also try to sketch in broadest outlines the social and religious life of the inhabitants of the country, of the Indians as well as of the European settlers. Half of the text is apportioned to colonial history, including the making of the United States, and the other half sketches the history of the country from that time till 1912. The narrative is generally as satisfactory as can be expected when such a large subject is compressed within such a narrow space. Under the circumstances, it is a little surprising to find four preliminary chapters before the actual settlement of the thirteen colonies is taken in hand. Yet there is no attempt to give the European background to American colonization. The first two chapters accept the traditional view of the precolumbian idea of the world and of the project and work of Columbus himself. This view has been seriously challenged in the conclusions reached in his researches by Henri Vignaud in his three volumes, *Histoire Critique de la Grande Entreprise de Christophe Colomb*, and *Études Critiques sur la Vie de Colomb*. It is to be regretted that the work has been printed on the cheapest of paper.

F. ZWIERLEIN.

New England and The Bavarian Illuminati. By Vernon Stauffer, Ph.D., Dean and Professor of New Testament and Church History, Hiram College, Ohio. Vol. lxxxii of *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law* edited by the faculty of Political Science, Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press, 1918. Pp. 360.

This is a very interesting and a very suggestive study in a comparatively neglected field of American history. The reason for this neglect is, perhaps, not hard to fathom. The bitterly anti-Masonic attitude of the American public at the close of the eighteenth century is at once a difficult and a delicate question. It is difficult, for it is hard to trace the political workings of secret societies; the sources are biased and unreliable, designedly ambiguous and misleading. It is delicate, for Freemasonry, with its ramifications, has become warp and woof of the political and social fabric of America.

The close of the eighteenth century witnessed a strange ferment, both social and religious, in New England life. This un-

rest was not confined to New England, but it was in such marked contrast to the white light of Puritan theocracy that it was like a dark thunder cloud to the New England prophets. This ferment was a natural consequence of the first enthusiasm with which America received the news of the French Revolution and the birth of a sister republic. The disorders in France were at first excused as the throes of the death agony of the monarchy and the pains of parturition accompanying the birth of the new republic. That was until fuller reports of the excesses of the revolution and its violently anti-religious tendencies reached New England. Then the prophets became alarmed, especially when they saw the Jacobin clubs established in their midst. They saw now, not a mere revolution but a world-wide conspiracy to overthrow religion and government. This was the work of the secret societies. They hesitated, at first, to attribute the conspiracy to the Masons of English antecedents, but sought to lay the blame on the influence of the Bavarian Illuminati, a Masonic society of German origin.

Professor Stauffer succeeds in proving an historical alibi for the Illuminati, at least as an organization. They had ceased to exist as a society in 1789, and therefore they did not, and could not, cause the aforesaid social disturbances. One naturally asks, then, why perfectly reputable people have consistently believed in the sinister influence of the Bavarian Illuminati on early American politics. Professor Stauffer, however, absolves the Illuminati—adduces sufficient cause for the agitation, and sends the Freemasons on their way with his blessing.

The main points of his thesis the author proves very satisfactorily and with considerable skill. Wide, painstaking research and a high degree of analytic power are evinced by the long list of books, pamphlets and newspapers consulted, and by the judicious use which the author generally makes of his researches. It is to be regretted, however, that in one important chapter he was obliged to rely so much upon the work of previous investigators, apparently not so competent as he. But of this, more anon.

"The development of this thesis," says Professor Stauffer in his introduction, "calls for an evaluation of the more significant elements and forces, which gave to the period the characteristic

temper of nervous excitability by which it was stamped." In the first chapter, consequently, the author depicts from original sources the religious and social phenomena which marked the decline and fall of the Puritanic theocratic ideals of gloom and intolerance. The clerical pamphleteers of the time bewail in turgid periods the growing looseness of morals, the popular discontent with the union of church and state, and the alarming growth of scepticism, rationalism, and even atheism.

As a complement to the first chapter, the second, entitled "Political Entanglements and Hysteria," informs us of the civic unrest and commotion, which told that the ferment of the French Revolution was at work among the masses. The French Revolution was, indeed, the all-absorbing topic of the day. Political parties became divided, and popular excitement was greatly increased by the arrival of Citizen Genet and the concomitant rise of numerous "self-created" democratic societies, particularly in New England. Around these societies centers the dispute. What was the power behind them? What was the spirit that inspired them?

The author does not immediately gratify our curiosity. We quote a few words that aptly sum up his evaluation:

"With the European situation to lend strong emphasis to the suggestion of sinister tendencies and secret combinations, it cannot be thought extraordinary that here in America, where traditional opinions and institutions were as certainly being undermined, the conviction should take root that beneath all this commotion over foreign and domestic policies, secret forces must be at work, perfecting organizations, promoting conspiracies, and ready at any hour to leap forth into the light to throttle government and order."

Well-entrenched tradition has asserted that the secret force responsible for the New England disturbances was the Bavarian Society of the Illuminati. In the third chapter, therefore, the author discusses the life of Adam Weishaupt, founder of the Illuminati. He shows how, after "an educational experience which had made him a passionate enemy of clericalism, Weishaupt, Professor of Law at the University of Ingoldstadt, arrived at the conclusion that a general offensive against the clerical party ought immediately to be undertaken . . . to overthrow

the forces of superstition and error." He would found a model secret organization, "comprising 'schools of wisdom,' . . . wherein those truths, which the folly and egotism of priests banned from the public chairs of education, might be taught with perfect freedom to susceptible youths." On May 1, 1776, the organization was founded. Under Weishaupt's sole domination, the Order was stagnant. With the accession, however, of Baron Knigge, a Freemason of high degree, progress resulted, and eventually an alliance with Freemasonry was effected. Internal dissension, the scandalous lives of the leaders, and political intrigues brought about suppression at the hands of the Bavarian Government. On August 16, 1787, the Duke of Bavaria "launched his third and last edict against the system. The measures taken against the Order in Bavaria effectually counteracted and destroyed its activity in other countries." This, on the authority of Professor Stauffer.

Having disposed thus of the true history of the Order, the professor addresses himself to its false history in a chapter which he entitles "The Legend of the Order." He examines two books which are the sources of accusations against the Illuminati—one by John Robison, an English savant and Freemason, *Proofs of a Conspiracy against all the Religions and Governments of Europe carried on in the Secret Meetings of the Freemasons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies;* the other by the Jesuit, Abbé Baruel, an émigré priest, *Memoirs of Jacobinism*. Many statements of both authors, anent the matter of the Illuminati, succumb before Professor Stauffer's scientific onslaughts.

But the methods of modern critical history were unknown in the days of which this study treats. The old school was more rhetorical than critical. These particular books were sensational. They were sold; they were read—especially by conservative folk. They found their way from Europe to New England; and here we have the solution of the whole affair—they fell into the hands of the vigilant watchmen on the housetops of Israel. A copy of Robison's book inspired the Reverend Jedediah Morse of Charlestown. This worthy divine, father of the famous Samuel Morse, had been greatly perturbed by the unrest everywhere about him, by the recent formation of secret societies, by the heated controversy over America's attitude toward France. He had

viewed with dismay the rise of Liberalism, and the spirit of secularism. The excesses of the French Revolution had brought horror to his soul—and here was Robison's work, affording splendid material for a pulpit exposé.

He read. He believed. "On the morning of May 9, 1798, and on the afternoon of the same day, in his own pulpit . . . the Reverend Jedediah Morse proclaimed the fact that a pernicious society, called the Illuminati, subversive of law, order and religion, had its branches established and its emissaries at work in America. The Jacobins in France were the open manifestation of the hidden system of the Illuminati. . . ."

Public attention was drawn to the statements. The newspapers commented on it. Morse was called to account and required to submit proofs. The proofs advanced by him were insufficient, inept; but the Bavarian Illuminati, from that time, were doomed to bear an unsavory reputation for complicity in the social upheavals of New England. Thus reasons Professor Stauffer.

The Illuminati, beyond doubt, were dead and gone. They had, once upon a time, however, concluded an alliance with the Masons. The connection had been mentioned in the controversy following the sermon, so that the odium attached to the name "Illuminati" had, in a measure, fallen upon the Freemasons of America. Professor Stauffer, therefore, proceeds to exonerate them from all suspicion, but not with very notable success, in the face of authorities like John Quincy Adams, second President of the United States.

The legend of the Illuminati is nearly finished. One more stage, and the author is done. Their name finally appears as an epithet to be bandied about by political rivals—"a term for politicians to conjure with." *Reductio ad absurdum*, with a vengeance! And so ends the book!

There is much to commend in Professor Stauffer's book. One chapter, however, is very disappointing, the third, entitled, "History of the European Order of the Illuminati." In this it is all too evident that Professor Stauffer has used prejudiced authorities. He did not dip his pen into the venom of religious bigotry, perhaps, but he forgot to wipe the pen that others had used before him. We could wish that he had not followed Fores-

tier[1] so implicitly, in believing the "Jesuit Legend," namely, that the Jesuits, after their suppression, attempted to join the secret societies extant, in order to use them for Jesuitical designs. There is far less historical ground for this fable than for the "Legend of the Illuminati," which he scientifically rejects. He has avoided Scylla and fallen into Charybdis. Throughout the chapter, a noted antipathy to the Society of Jesus is evident, in sundry unmistakable innuendoes. Nor is this all. The usual time-worn insinuations, accomplished chiefly by discriminating epithets, are all found in the armory of the Professor from Hiram College . . . "the forces of Clericalism . . . Sacerdotalism . . . quenching of originality . . . and intellectual stagnation due to ecclesiastical domination"—these and other damaging phrases, supported by copious footnotes in French and German, show the need of the apology which the professor makes in his preface for his almost exclusive use of one authority for this chapter. *C'est la guerre!* One cannot refrain from giving the most offensive example:

"Following the suppression of the Jesuits in 1773, members of that Order in considerable numbers, attracted by the rapid growth and pretentious occultism of the Rosicrucians, had united with the latter system." Shades of Christian Rosenkreuz and Hermes Trismegistus! What an alliance! We would like to hear more of the Jesuits, Frank and Stadler, the villains of the drama. Sources, sources, Professor! Your proof of this part of your thesis is a bit weak!

Technically Professor Stauffer has proved his thesis. However, one lays down the book convinced that while the Illuminati, *qua* organization, did not have the effect on American politics attributed to it, *qua* crystallization of the Zeitgeist, it changed the whole trend of continental Freemasonry and gave to it its secularizing and anticlerical policy. The soul of the Illuminati survived the death of the body. It animated the French Revolution, and, via France, came to America. Before this period New England was theocratic. Since then it has been secularist—almost anti-clerical—in its public policy.

JOSEPH A. MURPHY, D.D.

---

[1] FORESTIER. *Les Illuminés de Bavière et la Franc-Maçonnerie allemande.*

The Present Conflict of Ideals; A Study of the Philosophical Background of the World War. By Ralph Barton Perry, Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. Pp. 549. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1918.

The present volume, from the pen of the Professor of Philosophy at Harvard, embodies a course of lectures delivered by him at the University of California during the spring of 1918. The first and larger part of the work is a survey of the various philosophic tendencies of the day in their "moral, emotional, political and religious implications" and is designed to serve as a companion volume to the earlier work of the author, "Present Philosophic Tendencies," published in 1912. The second part of the book "attempts to relate these tendencies to the conflicting national ideals of the present war" To this end, after a consideration of the principle of nationality, the author undertakes the difficult task of analyzing and comparing the German, French, English and American national traits, characteristics of thought as well as their distinctive political, social and religious ideals. All this was inspired chiefly by the desire to bring out more clearly the deeper issues underlying the World War and to make more manifest the cause of the Allies. The author's analysis of the conflicting national traits is very suggestive and has much to commend it. There will be many no doubt who will not be disposed to accept as final his conclusions on this delicate subject, representing as they do what is to a large degree a personal estimate. After making due allowances for this fact, the views expressed will be found at any rate very interesting and worthy of consideration since they are clearly the result of wide reading, close observation and deep penetration on the part of the author.

The study of the moral and religious implications found in our present day philosophic tendencies, treated in the first part of the work and comprising three hundred and eighty pages of the whole, will be found more valuable and of more enduring interest. It is well written, the style is easy and clear, devoid of technicalities and involved argument. The author limits himself to the objective exposition and application of the tendencies he discusses to the questions of religion and morality, and does not in the present volume attempt to sift or refute the arguments by which their positions might be justified. The standpoint of the author is stated in the Introduction, "That which is tradi-

tional and established, common to modern European Christendom, I take as sea-level, from which to measure the heights and depths; or as the normal temperature by which to judge the chills and fevers of reaction and innovation" (p. 8). Following the lines laid down in the "Present Philosophic Tendencies," the main tendencies of the age are reduced to four: naturalism, idealism, pragmatism and realism. The moral ideals which spring from these are discussed in turn with keen penetration and powers of logic. The discussion on naturalism, "the mightiest tendency of the day," is particularly well done. By this term the author understands "such philosophy as grows directly out of the methods or results of the physical sciences." Its four-fold manifestations are shown to include the various forms of material metaphysics, based upon "a corporeal and mechanical view of reality"; the scientific method adopted "as a creed and code"; the numerous sociological theories, which follow the application of materialism and the scientific method to the life of man and the consequent "Discovery of Society"; finally the moral and religious effects of the extension of the biological principles of evolution to the whole field of human life Under these headings there are timely discussions on Positivism, Utilitarianism, the Ethics of Spencer, the Ethics of Darwinism, the Nietzschlian doctrine of the Superman, and the popular democratic and humanitarian theories of the day. An entire chapter is given over to socialism and the ethical implications of Economic Determinism, the fundamental doctrine of Scientific Socialism, and the opposition of the movement to religion are properly emphasized. The clear exposition of its attitude to religion and morality is all the more timely in view of the fact noted by the author that "socialism is the most powerful disturbing and innovating agency abroad in the world today" (p. 87).

Under idealism, "the philosophy which proclaims the ascendancy or priority of the world of consciousness over the world of bodies" (p. 8), the author first discusses the views which spring from the established moral and religious beliefs. Then, theism, voluntarism, Kantian ethics and the systems derived therefrom are considered. The influence exercised by the philosophy of Kant, Fichte and Hegel in the development of the prevailing German theory of the functions of the state forms the theme of a distinct chapter on "The Absolutist Conception of the

State." Speaking on the attitude of personal idea'ism toward the problem of evil, the author gives evidence of an altogether wrong conception of "common-sense" Christianity when he makes the statement, "personal idealism, like 'common-sense' Christianity, holds to the goodness of God, and is correspondingly doubtful about His omnipotence" (p. 215). On the contrary, while acknowledging the difficulties presented by the problem, common-sense Christianity proclaims both goodness and omnipotence to be necessary attributes of the Supreme Being, and realizes well that any other view of the matter would destroy our notion of God and would be opposed to the dictate of sound reason.

The section on pragmatism considers the effects of its assaults upon reason, and includes a discussion of the principles of James and Dewey and an outline of the Practical Philosophy of Bergson. The brief exposition of the relation of Modernism to the truths of religion will be found of interest to Catholics.

The first part of the work concludes with a study of the ideals which are derived from realism for which the author hopes much in the days to come. The writer is himself a rea'ist, or, more properly speaking, he belongs to the narrower circle of those who distinguish themselves from the followers of Platonic realism by the title new or neo-Realists. The teachings of this school are based upon the three principles: "factual independence," "externality of relations," and "immanence of consciousness." Of these the most important is factual independence, or the recognition that "the object of knowledge is always some fact that stands there independently of the knowing of it" (p. 364). This "common-sense" view of the matter, it is needless to say, is new only in name. The same may be said in truth of most of the "discoveries" of neo-realism, which are really worth while. For years they have been taught, under other names perhaps, in our schools, and will be found incorporated in that traditional philosophy which has developed from the principles of Aristotle, and as corrected, perfected and completed by the Schoolmen is generally known as Scholasticism or in its modern rëstatement as Neo-Scholasticism. It is this philosophy which, by reason of its truth, coherence and systematic unity, merits prëeminently the name of philosophy. About its claims the author is silent; nor does it receive any

mention among the philosophic tendencies of the day. One might expect at least a statement of the philosophy of the great Mercier, who did so much to bring out clearly the moral issues underlying the war. The explanation can only be that the author is unacquainted with the real meaning of this philosophy. His few references to it betray this fact. Had he examined at close range the teachings of Scholasticism, in his account in the chapter on "French Thought" of the growth of the new idealism in France, he would not have made the statement: "In philosophy proper it is pragmatism instead of intellectualism; in the churches, it is the 'new apologetic' based on history and experience, in place of scholasticism and papal infallibility" (p. 457).

After a reading of the moral ideals presented by the tendencies discussed in the present volume one is impressed by their vagueness, uncertainty and inadequacy. One appreciates all the more in consequence the value of Catholic Philosophy, which in completeness, thoroughness and certainty of conviction stands alone. No other philosophy in fact can give so satisfactory an answer to the questions of religion and morality, and so adequately appease the cravings and justify the hopes of the human heart. It is this discovery, the result of an intellectual conviction, which has led so many in recent years, after many wanderings in barren pastures, to enter the Church, and has brought about among the literary leaders of France a reaction in favor of the Catholic Religion. The author misses the point altogether and fails to grasp the true significance of this movement when, without any distinctions, he attributes the return of Bourget, for instance, to the Church to the craving of a jaded appetite for new sensations. I quote the passage: "The psychologues go to prison, or go mad, or even get religion in order to find new pastures where their jaded sensibilities may still be quickened. When new things are exhausted, old and forgotten things must be revived. Hence the return to mediaevalism and Romanism by writers such as Huysmans, Bourget and Barrés" (p. 73).

Despite these occasional lapses, however, the work as a whole is a very worthy one, and will be found useful as a supplement to the history of philosophy or as an introduction to the study of modern ethics.

JOSEPH A. HICKEY, O.S.A., D.D.

Historic Mackinac. The Historical, Picturesque and Legendary Features of the Mackinac Country. Illustrated from sketches, drawings, maps and photographs, with an original map of Mackinac Island, made especially for this work. By Edwin O. Wood, LL.D., formerly President Michigan Historical Commission, Vice-President of the Mackinac Island State Park Commission, Trustee of the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society. . . . In two volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918.

The two beautiful volumes comprise 1,500 pages of letterpress in addition to 125 pages of illustrations. A happy division of the work into two volumes assigns to Volume I the technically historical treatment of the subject, and to Volume II a wonderfully rich selection from the romantic, descriptive and legendary literature that has grown up around Mackinac Island.

The author speaks of his achievement as a "labor of love" and modestly declares that it makes "no claim to rank with the achievements of historians." Yet his labor of love extended through years of patient, zealous and discriminating toil—a toil made feasible largely through his official positions relating to the territory and the history of the Mackinac country, made vivid and attractive by many summers spent on the Island, and made copiously fruitful by his facile consultation of an extensive collection of books of travel, fiction, history, legendary lore, maps of the Great Lakes region, which he had been making for some years. His bibliography covers sixty pages, and the Index as many columns.

The first volume is not a history in the technical sense, and yet is in some respects better than such a history. It is almost "a historians' history"—not indeed of the world, but—of Mackinac Island. The *Jesuit Relations* is the most frequently quoted source, and the many excerpts from that stately series of volumes are highly interesting and informative, valuable alike for their supreme quality as original sources of history and for their attractive literary form. But the author of *Historic Mackinac*, weaving into his narrative a large number of selections from most varied sources, "new and old" (like the prudent householder of the Gospels), and often adding thus pleasantly piquant touches to the tale, finds it possible also to make the justified claim that many items are taken from books long since out of print, and

therefore not readily available to the casual reader. But books —especially pamphlets—not long out of print, are often fairly inaccessible to the casual reader. Dr. Wood devotes a whole chapter to excerpts from a monograph by Judge Brown, and tells us in a footnote (I, 90) that "the quotations in this chapter are taken from a reprint which does *not bear date and place of publication. The Parish Register of the Mission of Michilimackinac* forms the second part of the pamphlet, and begins at page 29, the author being Judge Edward Osgood Brown, a noted jurist and eminent scholar, of Chicago, Illinois, who is a recognized authority upon the history of the Mackinac country." The phrase upon which the reviewer has ventured to confer italics is quite significant to the librarian and the bibliographer, both of whom have their own troubles with housing and indexing pamphlets; and the casual reader is in still greater danger of missing Judge Brown's charming and most illuminating monograph. We thank Dr. Wood for enshrining so much of it within a stately volume and thus ensuring it a long life and a wider circle of admirers. For if ever a deft inspirational touch could make the dust of centuries glow with actuality, could ever articulate anew the dead bones of the past into a living and breathing frame, that is the miracle performed by Judge Brown with the *Parish Register*. Read the chapter—having always in mind the normally forbidding and dry-as-dust character of a parish register—and pronounce just judgment! One quotation from it may be permitted here (p. 99): "There is another matter to which I think the register bears interesting testimony. It has been a too common opinion, springing from prejudice against the Church, that the Catholic missionaries' apparent success among the Indians arose from their taking them into the Church without sufficiently instructing them. I think Parkman even allows himself somewhere to speak of the Catholic missionary contenting himself with sprinkling a few drops of water upon the forehead of his savage proselyte, while the Protestants tried to win him from his barbarism and prepare his savage heart for the truths of Christianity. There is absolutely no truth in this, and no evidence has ever been cited for it. And this register, like all the missionary registers, is affirmative proof of its falsity." The Judge develops this affirmative proof through several pages of citation from the register.

Although Dr. Wood thus extracts copiously from a multitude of writers, he nevertheless tells the story himself in an attractive and, despite occasional digressions made to illustrate some particular phase of ethnology or chronology, in a fairly consecutive manner. He furnishes a skilful setting, and not merely a literary cement, for a rich mosaic whose separate fragments have been taken from the works of other men of most varied minds and literary styles.

Mackinac history is somewhat like the biography of an important statesman. The Island, like the man, becomes a little stage for a great drama of history; for the story of Mackinac, like the life of a great man, touches many wide and diversified interests and activities and thus becomes a cross-section of history. The intrigues of European diplomacy have their repercussions in America. "In order," said Macaulay, "that Frederick the Great might rob a neighbor whom he had promised to defend, black men fought on the coast of Coromandel and red men scalped each other by the Great Lakes of North America." And events of world-wide significance, signalized by names that breathe of romance and wild adventuring into the aboriginal wildernesses, occurred in the Mackinac country under the successive flags of France, England, and the United States. The complete story even of this small stage of Mackinac Island is entrancing at once and greatly informative.

Dr. Wood has conferred something of an encyclopedic scope upon his two volumes. The first, for instance, incorporates the exhaustive treatise of Monsignor O'Brien on the names of places of interest on the Island (I. 507–606). Dr. Wood dedicates his work to Monsignor O'Brien in terms of warmest appreciation. This volume also contains (pp. 379–429) an account of the churches on the Island as well as a chronology (pp. 681–697) from 1534 to 1918. Similarly, the second volume includes treatises on the Indian names in the Mackinac country (pp. 624–640) and on the flowering plants, ferns and their allies of the Island (pp. 641–678), although its main purpose was "to bring together and preserve for the reader of today and in years to come, some of the graphic descriptions given by celebrated travelers who visited the Island many years ago. To this end, Volume II is largely a collection of

extracts from books long since out of print, all of which will ever hold an important place in the story of 'The Fairy Isle.'"

The printing is excellently done. If there be misprints, the reviewer has failed to observe them. Attention may be directed, however, to an obvious slip of the pen: "Nearly three hundred years ago Jacques Cartier . . . was commissioned . . . to find a passage-way through the newly discovered lands to the Golden West. In 1535 he reached the site of Montreal . . ." The reader will see immediately that "three hundred" should be "four hundred."

There are some unnecessary repetitions which, however, are easily pardonable in a work of this kind; *e. g.*, Father Dablon's account of the Mission of St. Ignace is quoted extensively (I, 17–21) and is repeated in indirect narration (p. 25 *seq.*).

The Appendix of highly interesting documents (I, 609, 676) would have proved additionally valuable if references were made to it in appropriate portions of the text. And if, whensoever an Indian word or name appeared in the text for the first time, a reference were forthwith given to the enlightening chapter on "Indian Names in the Mackinac Country" (II, 624–640), the reader would be spared some futile cogitation and perplexity; *e.g.*, with respect to the meaning of "Michilimackinac," the identity of the Chippewas and Ojibways, the transliteration of Outaouacs into Ottawas, and the like. For he may well be puzzled as he reads such explanations as these respecting Michilimackinac: "The Indians were attracted to the Island waters especially by the abundance of fish . . . 'This spot is the most noted in all these regions for its abundance of fish,' says Dablon, 'since, *in savage parlance*, this is its native country. . . .' Indeed, these waters contained fish not common to all the region" (I, 25, 26). We have italicized Father Dablon's phrase, as it seems to furnish the meaning of the word *Michilimackinac* as the native haunts of the fish. The same meaning is implied in Constance Fenimore Woolson's article on Mackinac (quoted, I, 33): "The deep water around Fairy Island was called 'the home of the fishes.' Day after day the canoes assembled at Iroquois Point . . ." The reader will contentedly accept this information, and will therefore be surprised to find Cadillac quoted (I, 74) as follows: "The word Missilimakinak means

'Island of the Tortoise.' The reason why it is so called may be either because it is shaped like a tortoise, or because turtles are found in the vicinity." And further on, Alexander Henry is quoted (I, 203), giving the same meaning to the word without hesitation, but applying it somewhat differently: "It is this mountain which constitutes that high land, in the middle of the island, of which I have spoken before, as of a figure considered as resembling a *turtle*, and therefore called *michilimackinac*." Balanced thus between conflicting authorities, the reader will experience a new shock when he reads (II, 53) that "the modern meaning of the name Missilimackinac among the Indians is 'the place of dancing spirits'"; and, a little further on (II, 54), that the word means "great monsters." Now Dr. Wood includes a chapter on Indian names. It occurs towards the close of the second volume, and therefore might easily escape the observation of one who is reading the first volume. A reference to that chapter and to the word Michilimackinac would have saved the reader from being both puzzled and misled, and such a reference might well have been made in each of the cases of derivation cited here. In that chapter Dr. Wood informs us that "the meaning of the term is utterly unknown to the Indians of the present day. The whites, too, have invariably failed in analyzing and explaining the word" (II, 631). Analyzing the word etymologically, Dr. Wood appears inclined to think that it refers to the "arch rock," the greatest natural curiosity on the Island. It has nothing to do with "the home of the fishes," or a resemblance to a turtle, or "great monsters."

In the mere matter of the spelling of the Island's name, the reader may also be confused through lack of an early footnote. There is indeed a valuable digression (I, 16-17) on the geographical application of the name and on its correct pronunciation, in which the author explains that when (except in quotation) he uses the word "Mackinac" (pronounced Mackinaw) he is referring to the Island, and when he uses the word "Mackinaw" he is referring to the site on the south side of the Straits. But the reader will soon come upon highly varied forms of the longer word. Thus Dablon writes it Missilimackinac (I, 17); Father Le Clerq, Michilimackinac (I, 30); the author himself ends it with "c" (I, 16) and with "ck" (I, 49), while a quotation (I, 211)

from the *Jesuit Relations* ends the word with "a," omitting both the "c" and the "ck." An early reference to the chapter on Indian names would have helped the reader, as he would find four variants there given of the name, together with an interesting declaration that Father Marquette's spelling, "Michilimakinong," comes nearest to the Indian pronunciation ("Mishinimakinang"). Dr. Wood might have added that the word is spelled in no less than thirteen different ways in the *Jesuit Relations*.

A similar difficulty will confront "the general reader" in the word *Outaouacs*, introduced first in Father Dablon's narrative (I, 18). Must such a reader (and Dr. Wood's volumes presumably contemplated principally that large class) be expected forthwith to recognize the Ottawas? The elaborate Index will not help him, for the word is not given there; and he would be grateful for some such reference as "See *Ottawa*, II, 632."

The transliteration of Indian names into French, English (and may we not add "United States?") vocal equivalents is often puzzling even to a thoughtful reader. There is comfort in the genial confession made by Judge Brown in his lecture (already referred to) on the parish register of Michilimackinac. Although certified by Dr. Wood as "a recognized authority upon the history of the Mackinac country" (I, 90, footnote), Judge Brown admits that he was for a time puzzled by the word *Panis* in the parish register, that he consulted dictionaries of ancient and modern French for a hint of the word's meaning, and that he finally found a clue in a note of the *Wisconsin Historical Collections*—a note not explaining the word but merely referring casually to the tribe of the *Panis* ("evidently pawnee," concludes Judge Brown).

Finally, the rich abundance of illustrations forms a striking feature of the two volumes. Some of them lack, however, such an explanatory legend as the reader of a historical work ordinarily expects to find. Thus the full-page illustration facing page 80 (Vol. I) is entitled "Jean Nicolet's Introduction to the Indians." Is the picture an original design for this work, or is it mayhap from the photograph of an oil painting? The same question might be asked concerning the full-page pictures facing pages 2 (Jacques Cartier), 3 (Champlain), 160 (Father Gabriel Richard), 188 (Alexander Henry), 273 ("The Missionary"), etc. Even the

smaller illustrations (*e. g.*, p. 121) would become more interesting if an indication of their source were given. We find, for instance, a picture of "The Griffin" (I, 59) apparently reproduced from an old print, in which the vessel is represented as very different in appearance from that in Koerner's painting, "The Sailing of the Griffon" (opposite page 50 in the same volume). The reader would naturally wish to know the source of the illustration on page 59; and, by the way, he might also wish to know why historians refer to the vessel as *The Griffin* rather than the *Griffon*. The Index gives only *Griffin*.

The excellent care expended on the volumes by both author and publisher leads the present reviewer to offer these suggestions *de minimis* for consideration for a second edition of this interesting and valuable work.

H. T. Henry, Litt.D.

NOTES AND COMMENT

Entering upon a course of study in the history of Catholicism in the United States, the student soon finds himself confined to a very small number of books. Of general histories of the Church in this country, there is but one which pretends to offer a complete narrative; of special histories, either limited by time, place or idea, very few do more than repeat the work of John Gilmary Shea. No historiography of American Catholic history has been written for the guidance of the student, if we except the article in the Louvain *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Vol. i, 1900)—*L'Histoire de l'Église Catholique aux États-Unis*, by the present Rector of the Catholic University, the Right Reverend Thomas J. Shahan, D.D. Bishop Shahan has classified the writings in American Church History under the following heads: *Relations with the Holy See; Conciliar Legislation; History of the Missions; State of the Clergy; Catholic Press; Catholic Historical Societies; Archival Depots.* "Rien ne nous manque," he says at the end of his essay, "tant qu'une bibliographie générale de notre histoire ecclésiastique."

Bishop O'Gorman has given us a tentative bibliography of American Church history in his *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States* (New York 4th edition, 1907); but the surprising part of Shea's classic production in four volumes—the title is identical to that of Bishop O'Gorman's volume— is that the historian of the Church in the United States failed to profit by his cooperation with Justin Winsor, to whose *Narrative and Critical History of America* he had contributed. Shea's genius lived too much with the past for him to see in vision the student of a later day laboriously scanning his pages for references to the source-material he used.

The Preface to his first volume which carries the story of Catholicism from the days of Columbus down to the end of the French and Indian War (1492-1763), describes the projects for such a general history which had been outlined up to his day. The earliest of these is that of Bishop Bruté, of the Diocese of Vincennes (now Indianapolis), a work to be called *Catholic America*, which was "to give an outline of the history of the Church in South America, Mexico, Central America and Canada, before taking up the annals of religion in the Thirteen Colonies and under the Republic. The sketch would have been necessarily very brief, and from the heads of chapters, as given by him, would have been mainly contemporary." So far as is known, Bishop Bruté never began the actual composition of this work. No mention of it is found in Bayley, *Memoirs of Bishop Bruté* (New York, 1865), or in Bruté de Remur, *Vie de Mgr. Bruté de Remur, premier évêque de Vincennes* (Rennes, 1887). The Rev. Dr. Charles I. White, the biographer of Mother Seton, also proposed to write a history of the Church in this

country, and with Col. B. U. Campbell collected a mass of source-material for that purpose. Shea says that "he never actually wrote any part of his projected work, nothing having been found among his papers except a sketch of his plan." Dr. White did contribute to the English translation of Darras' *General History of the Church* (New York, 1865), an Appendix (Vol. v, pp. 599–662) entitled: *Sketch of the Origin and Progress of the Catholic Church in the United States.*

The first actual contribution to the general ecclesiastical history of the United States appeared in the Paris *Univers*, from the pen of Henry De Courcy de la Roche Héron. During De Courcy's sojourn in this country, John Gilmary Shea placed at his disposal all the historical material he had gathered up to that time, and after the articles ceased in the *Univers*, Shea translated them and put them in book form: *History of the Catholic Church in the United States from the earliest settlement of the country to the present time, with biographical sketches, accounts of the religious orders, councils, etc.* New York, 2d edition, 1879. "This volume," Shea wrote in 1892, "has been for some thirty years the most comprehensive account accessible of the history of the Church in this country." De Courcy treated only a limited part of the subject, however, and immediately after the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), the Fathers of the Council commissioned Dr. Shea to fulfil his long-cherished desire of writing and publishing a complete *History of the Catholic Church in the United Sttaes.*

Archbishop Corrigan wrote at the time of Shea's death: "No one could have brought to the task a better preparation—unremitting study of a lifetime; greater devotion to the cause, or more painstaking attention to accuracy of detail. The Church in the United States owes to his memory a deep debt of gratitude. Future historians will find in his lifelong researches a mine of wealth, and generations to come will rise up and call him blessed." John Gilmary Shea had begun his historical publications at the age of fourteen, when in 1838 he contributed a striking historical portrait of Cardinal Albornoz to the *Young People's Catholic Magazine.* His first profound study was the *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley*, (New York, 1852). This was soon followed by his *History of the Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the United States* (1529–1854), (New York, 1854); his twenty-six small volumes entitled the *Cramoisy Series*, begun in 1857; and *The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886). The preparation of the *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* can really be said to have begun as far back as 1837, when he became a clerk in a Spanish merchant's office in New York City. The first volume of his *History* appeared in 1886, the second in 1888, the third in 1890, and the last chapter of the fourth volume was finished on his deathbed in February, 1892. Shea's *History* covers the years 1492 down to 1866. He left considerable material for the years which follow down to his own day, and through the generosity and historical-mindedness of the Society of Jesus many of his manuscripts and papers were purchased and are now safely housed in the *Georgetown Archives.*

One other volume of a general nature which should be mentioned is John O'Kane Murray, *A Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1876). Of little historical value on account of its many inaccuracies, Murray's volume contains excellent appendices on various aspects of Catholicism in the United States, particularly on the problem of loss and gain in the American Church.

Bishop O'Gorman's *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States* (Vol. ix of *The American Church Series*, Scribner's, New York) first appeared in 1895. The fourth edition is dated 1917. As a serviceable manual, this volume is praiseworthy in every respect; but its value would have been greatly enhanced if it had included the modern apparatus of references and notes which furnish guides to the research worker.

The Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur published in 1911 a *Brief History of the Catholic Church in the United States for use in Catholic Schools*, compiled chiefly from Shea. The Preface gives a hint to the fact that the well-known Catholic publisher of Philadelphia, Mr. John Joseph McVey, has in his possession much of Shea's original source-material. This little *Compendium* deserves to be better known. It is strengthened by four ecclesiastical maps which will not be found elsewhere.

To the Franciscan Sisters of La Crosse, Wisconsin, we owe two volumes: *Our Country in Story*, intended for use in the fifth and sixth grades of our elementary schools (Chicago, 1917), and a *History of the United States for Catholic Schools* (Chicago, 1914), which is especially valuable for the just estimate it gives of the Catholic background to American history.

The foregoing paragraphs are offered as an introduction to the general topic of American Catholic historiography. Of special histories of the Church in the United States, a more numerous bibliography might be given. Following the accepted division of special history—that of *time*, *place*, and *subject*, there is already a large library of volumes which would need to be listed under the headings: *Provincial Histories*, the best of which is the *History of the Church in New England* (2 vols., Boston, 1899), by different authors for the different dioceses; *Diocesan Histories*, of which we have already published a complete list in this REVIEW (Vol. iv, pp. 264–273, 389–393, 542–546); *Parochial Histories*, the best models of which are those of German parishes throughout the country; *Corporative Histories*, namely, of the religious orders and congregations, and of Church societies, etc., for which general subject the American Church is still waiting the advent of a painstaking Heimbucher; *Ecclesiastical Biographies*, which we have begun to catalogue in the April, 1919, issue of this REVIEW; and such other headings as would describe the inner life of the Church in this country; Dogmatic Histories; Histories of Apologetical Literature; Histories of Worship and of Discipline; Hagiography; Ascetical Histories; Scientific, Liter-

ary, Artistic Histories; Histories of Catholic Education; of Catholic Social Action; and Histories of the Relations between Church and State in the United States.

It should be understood, however, that the listing of these volumes does not constitute historiography. Fueter, in his *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (Munich, 1911), eliminates all Guides, Catalogues, Dictionaries, and Encyclopedias from the field of historiography. It is not sufficient to know *what* has been done, but *how* history has fared at the hands of Catholic American scholars. What needs to be done, and to be done in one volume, if possible, is to trace out in the work of the best historical writers of the Church in America the dependence, independence, or interdependence of their manner, method and originality; to note how far they supplement or control their predecessors; to detect—a very necessary procedure in American Church history—all plagiarisms; to approximate the sources at their disposal, their use or abuse of critical appraisal of these sources; to show how far each historian has proved to be an advance upon his predecessor; and how far American Catholic historical study has come along the broad highway towards modern scientific and critical scholarship.

A General History of the Catholic Church in the United States can hardly be attempted until all its leading topics be investigated in a scholarly way. Such a General History might be built upon the Winsor plan of having one general editor with chapters contributed by the best acknowledged writers in each locality. But uniformity of design and permanency of historical spirit could best be obtained if the whole work were the production of one writer.

The following are some of the topics which should be discussed beforehand by means of articles in this and other Catholic historical magazines:

1. The Navigatio Brendani.
2. Missionary activity of the Middle Ages (1200–1500).
3. America in medieval legends.
4. The Norse Church in America (1125–1492).
5. Cartography of the Middle Ages.
6. Catholic Discoverers and Explorers of the New World.
7. English Catholic Refugees in America.
8. The Avalon Expedition.
9. Crypto-Catholicism in the English Colonies.
10. The Penal Laws of the Colonies.
11. The American Martyrology.
12. The Spanish system of Colonial Church jurisdiction.
13. Church and State in New France.
14. *No Popery* in the English Colonies.
15. The Religious Clause of the Quebec Act.
16. American Catholics in foreign schools and colleges (1634–1791).
17. The Formation and Supply of the Clergy before 1791.

18. Catholic travellers in the new United States (1783–1810).
19. Loss and gain in Colonial Days.
20. Conciliar Legislation in the United States (1791–1852).
21. The Church and Immigration (1820–1919).
22. Catholics in the Wars of 1812, 1848, 1861, 1898.
23. Catholic nomenclature in the United States.
24. History of the word *Papist* in American literature.
25. Test Oaths in the English Colonies.
26. Lay organizations in the American Church.
27. Trusteeism.
28. Jansenism in the American Church.
29. The Ludwigsmission Verein.
30. The Leopoldine Association.
31. The Propagation of the Faith (of Lyons).
32. New Hampshire Intolerance.
33. Ecclesiastical Geography of the United States.
34. Catholic University Education in Latin America.
35. Episcopal visits *ad limina* before 1860.
36. Foreign Objects of Art sent to Churches in the United States.
37. Reconstruction of the Church in the South after the Civil War.
38. Religion in Presidential Campaigns.
39. Non-Catholic efforts at a Union of Church and State in the United States.
40. The Anti-Catholic Political Movements of the Past.
41. The Anti-Catholic Press.
42. The Catholic Attitude towards History.
43. Catholic Truth and Historical Truth.
44. Higher Criticism and Catholic History.
45. The Future of the Church in English-speaking countries.

These are a few of the topics from the field of special history which have not yet been fully treated by American Catholic historical writers.

Among the recent publications on the University of Louvain, are: Delannoy, *L'Université de Louvain—Conférences données au Collège du France en Fevrier, 1915* (with sixteen illustrations). Paris, 1915; Moreau, *La Bibliothéque de l'Université de Louvain 1636–1914* (with an appendix of illustrations of its ruins). Louvain, 1918; and T. W. Koch, *The University of Louvain and its Library* (with illustrations of its ruins). London, 1917.

Have you read *The Clash, a Study in Nationalities*, by William H. Moore (New York, 1919)? The book was first published in September, 1918, and is now in its seventh edition. It is the key to a proper knowledge of conditions, social and religious, in the Dominion of Canada.

The first word on what may prove to be a long series of pamphlets on the educational crisis which seems to be looming up in the land has been spoken by the Bishop of Covington, the Rt. Rev. Ferdinand Brossart, D.D.—*Pastoral Letter on*

the Necessity of Christian Education. The spirit of his message is that of the motto on his episcopal coat-of-arms—*Sectare Caritatem.*

Hidden behind a little brick church, whose walls have sheltered Catholic worshippers since 1792, lies a plot of ground scarcely a dozen feet square, surrounded by thick, high boxwood. No marble shaft rises to call the traveller's attention to this forgotten shrine of the Faith in the New World. No stone has been erected in the two centuries that have passed since Father Thomas Hodgson was buried there in 1726, to tell the wayfarer that here lie the mortal remains of confessors of the Church in days made dark by the anti-Catholic legislation of what was once the haven of refuge to all who were oppressed—Maryland, the land of sanctuary. No line has been carved to speak of the zeal and of the labors of one who ruled the entire Church in the English Colonies—Father John Lewis, the predecessor of Bishop Carroll in the same post. Even the occasional Philadelphian does not meet here with any bronze tablet to remind him that he walks on sacred ground, the last resting place of the founder of the Church in his great diocese: Father Joseph Greaton, who was buried here in 1753. Nothing but the loving memory of the Catholic Dorseys who occupy the farm at Bohemia Manor back of the old Jesuit House is here to keep the fires of tradition burning on this altar of early Catholic piety and devotion. No word has been left behind for the passer-by to recall the fact that this place is also sacred in the annals of Catholic education. For miles around on all sides, the visitor can see stretching off to the horizon, fine farms which were purchased in the early years of the eighteenth century by those who founded the *Mission of Bohemia Manor.*

We motored over from Middletown, Delaware, the guests of the present pastor of Middletown, of which Bohemia is now a mission, the Rev. Charles A. Crowley. Before setting out, Father Crowley showed us the *Registers* of the old Mission. The *Register of Marriages* was opened by Father Molyneux of Philadelphia fame on July 4, 1790, and this same *Register* is used today by Father Crowley. The *Register of Burials* is equally old. On the inside front cover is a letter from Father E. J. Devitt, S.J., to Father Daniel F. Haugh, S.J., who was the resident Jesuit at Bohemia:

Georgetown, January 12, 1895.

Dear Father Haugh,

P. C. In relation to the Chateaux, think that it might interest you to know of the Fathers buried at Bohemia. I send these notes taken from some papers that I have. They are Fr. Joseph Greaton, at Bohemia, from 1749 to 1753, when he died there. He was the Founder of St. Joseph's, Philadelphia: an Englishman, born at Ilfracombe. And Fr. Matthias Manners, a German, whose real name was Sittensperger, and in regard to whom Riley's book on Conewago gives information. He went to Bohemia in 1771. These two certainly were buried at your place. Besides, I have another old Catalogus, which says of Fr. Thomas Pulton, who was for a time there, under date of 1747: obiit 23 Jan. at Newtown. (Fr. Neale says Bohemia, as also Fr. Hunter.) Fr. John Lewis, who succeeded FF. Greaton and Manners, and who was

Superior of the whole Mission at the time of the suppression, is also reported as buried there.

. . . . . .

Yours in Domino,
(*Signed*) E. I. DEVITT, S.J.

In the *Burial Register*, we found a letter which had escaped the pastor's notice, from Father Thomas Hughes, S.J., the historian of the Jesuits in the United States:

St. Francis Xavier Coll.,
30 W. 16th St., New York,
October 9, 1899.

Rev. Dear Father,

I had expected to have the pleasure of writing to your Reverence from Georgetown before this; &, while repeating my acknowledgements for the extreme kindness with which you received us the other day, also to send you a note of the old Fathers, who had departed this life at Bohemia—all of whom, I take it, are buried there. I send you forthwith a little excerpt from some very old & authentic documents here:

Hodgson, or Hudson, { Thomas, Father; obiit Bohemiae, Dec. 14 or 18; Aet. 44, 1726;
Sittensperger, or Manners, { Matthias, Father; obiit Bohemiae, June 15, 1775.
Lewis, Joannes, Father Super.; obiit Bohemiae; Mar. 24, 1788; Aet. 67.

Two of these are mentioned, Frs. Greaton & Manners, in the letter of Fr. Devitt's inserted under the cover of your *Register of Burials*. Two others, Fr. Lewis & Pulton, are mentioned dubiously. Fr. Hodgson is not named by him.

Besides, you have in that same *Register* the entries:

1798, Bohemia, Aug. 21; the Revd. Stephen Faure; aet. 37 *circiter*.
1806, March 21; Revd. Charles Whelan, O.S.F.; aet. 65.
1819, August 1, Revd. Michel Jas. Cousinne, S.J., died "yesterday;" aet. 52 (*Novitius*).

There too is given the description of how the first, P. Faure, was laid; & the other two were placed aside of him.—I trust you will find this little notice satisfactory; & believe me, *In Corde JESU,*

Yours devotedly,
(*Signed*) THOS. HUGHES, S.J.

The Rev. Jno. E. Daly,
Bohemia, Warwick, Md.

The *Baptismal Register*, well-described by Father Devitt, S.J., in his admirable article *Bohemia: Mission of St. Francis Xavier, Cecil County, Maryland* (*Records* of the Amer. Cath. Hist. Society, Vol. xxiii [June, 1913], pp. 97–139,) contains entries dating back to 1750.

These three *Registers* are among the *incunabula* of the Church in this country. They are hardly likely to hold together much longer, and they should be housed in the Georgetown Archives.

Father Devitt gives (*l.c., ut supra*, p. 135) the names of the priests buried at Bohemia as follows.

Priests Buried at Bohemia	*Date and Country of Birth*	*Date of Death*
Thomas Hodgson (Hudson), S.J...	1682, England	18 Dec., 1726
Thomas Poulton (Pulton), S.J.....	1697, England	23 Jan., 1749
Joseph Greaton, S.J.....	1679, England	19 Aug., 1753
Matthias Manners (Sittensperger), S.J.....	1719, Germany	15 June, 1775
John Lewis, S.J.....	21 Oct., 1721, England	24 March, 1788
Stephen Faure.....	1761, France	21 Aug., 1798
Charles Whelan, O.S.F.....	1741, Ireland	21 Mar., 1806
Michael J. Cousinne, S.J.....	1 Nov., 1767, Belgium	31 July, 1819
Peter Epinette, S.J.....	24 Sept., 1760, France	8 Jan., 1832
John Baptist Cary, S.J.....	16 July, 1772, France	20 May, 1843

There is no unfairness in bringing to the notice of our readers the fact that we have all been guilty of neglect towards the memory of these gallant soldiers of the Cross. It is easily understood how even Philadelphia Catholics, whose generosity to all higher things is known the world over, should have forgotten Father Greaton, S.J., to whom they owe the beginning of the Faith in their diocese; but it is hard to understand how Father John Lewis, S.J., should be neglected by the entire Catholic Church of the United States, of which he was once the juridic chief.

In 1898, the Mission at Bohemia was transferred to the Bishop of Wilmington, but the church and now deserted house stand as they did for so many years in the center of wide acres, still in the possession of the Society of Jesus, whose members purchased these lands in the early years of the eighteenth century.

An interesting article appeared in the *Catholic Standard*, of Philadelphia, for February 11, 1888, entitled: *Our First College: Bohemia*. It was here that Father Thomas Pulton opened Bohemia Academy in 1745 or 1746. Here John Carroll, Daniel Carroll, Edward Neale, Robert Brent, Bennett Neale, Archibald Richard, and James Heath went to school. "Jackey Carroll," as his name appears in an old account book, became first Bishop of Baltimore forty years later. Bohemia Academy is usually spoken of as the forerunner of Georgetown College.

Noteworthy articles in the current Reviews: *Spanish Friars in the Oregon Country*, 1810–1811, by W. D. Robinson in the *Washington Historical Quarterly*, for April, 1919; *Mother Mary Patricia Waldron*, by H. J. Heuser, in the *Records* of the Amer. Cath. Hist. Society, for March, 1919; a *Legend of the Dying Girard*, in the same periodical, by H. T. Henry; *Religious Forces in the United States*, by Martha L. Edwards, *Mississippi Valley Hist. Review*, for March, 1919.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GUIDE TO THE BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES OF THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY [1]

CARRELL, Bishop George Aloysius, S.J. (1803–1868); Bp. of Covington, Ky. (1853–1868).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 20–21; CE, under *Covington;* MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 3, 12, 131, Vol. ii, pp. 140, 154, 178; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 37–39, 158–178 *passim*, 279, 380, 475, 489, 502–506 *passim*, 515, 545, Vol. ii, pp. 1, 60; WEBB, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky*, p. 350. Louisville, 1884; MAES, *Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx.* Cincinnati, 1880; MAES, *Golden Jubilee of the Diocese of Covington* (Pastoral letter, Nov., 1903); SPALDING, *Life of Flaget.* Louisville, 1852; SPALDING, *Sketches of Early Catholic Missions in Kentucky.* Louisville, 1844; SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Church in the United States*, Vol. iv, pp. 381, 541; *cf.* M. J. O'BRIEN, *Irish Pioneers in Kentucky.* New York, 1917; WILLCOX, *Historical Sketches of Some of the Pioneer Catholics of Philadelphia and Vicinity*, in ACHS *Records* for December, 1904, pp. 2–4 (see this for the genealogy of the Carrell family); DE COURCY-SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Church in the United States*, p. 242. New York, 1879; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 214; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 505–513; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. x, p. 19, Vol. xiii, pp. 66, Vol. xiv, p. 90; for his years at St. Louis University, *cf.* FANNING, *Historical Sketch of St. Louis University.* St. Louis, 1908; ID, *Diamond Jubilee of St. Louis University.* St. Louis, 1904; *cf.* CHR, Vol. ii, p. 289.

CARROLL, Bishop James J. (1863–1913); Bp. of Nueva Segovia, P. I. (1909–1912); resigned 1912.

Catholic Standard and Times (Philadelphia), files for April 4–11, 1913; KIRLIN, *Catholicity in Philadelphia*, p. 420. Philadelphia, 1909; *cf.* CHR, Vol. iv, p. 81.

CARROLL, Archbishop John (1735–1815); Superior of the Missions in the Thirteen Original States (1784–1785); Prefect-Apostolic (1785–1789); Bishop of Baltimore (1789–1808); Administrator of Diocese of New Orleans (1809–1815); Archbishop of Baltimore (1808–1815).

ARCHIVAL MATERIAL: There are twenty cases of *Letters and Correspondence, Private* and *Administrative*, in the *Baltimore Archives.* Many of these letters are rough sketches and copies of letters sent to Rome and elsewhere, and they have been admirably used by Shea in the second volume of his *History of the Catholic Church in the United States.* Shea procured copies of most of the Carroll correspondence from Rome and elsewhere and these *Shea Transcripts* are now in the *Georgetown Archives*, at the University of Georgetown. Both the *Baltimore Archives* and the *Georgetown Archives* are card-catalogued. The *Dominican Archives* at the Dominican House of Studies, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., contains many photostatic copies of Carroll's letters and reports from foreign archives. *Cf.* C. R. FISH, *Guide to*

[1] Continued from the April issue. ABBREVIATIONS: ACHS (American Catholic Historical Society); ACQR (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*); CE (*Catholic Encyclopedia*); CHR (*Catholic Historical Review*); AHR (*American Historical Review*); USCHS (*United States Catholic Historical Society*); CUB (*Catholic University Bulletin*).

the Materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives, Washington, D. C., 1911. See also, *United States Catholic Historical Magazine*, Vol. ii (1888), pp. 217–220; E. I. DEVITT, S.J., *Propaganda Documents: Appointment of the First Bishop of Baltimore*, in the ACHS *Records*, Vol. xxi, pp. 185–236. (Translation of original documents published in the AHR for July, 1910, pp. 801–839. *Cf.* also *Carroll Correspondence*, edited by E. I. DEVITT, S.J., in ACHS *Records*, Vol. xix (1908), pp. 214, 243, 385, 455, Vol. xx (1909), pp. 49, 193, 250, 432.

BIOGRAPHIES: BRENT, *Biographical Sketch of the Most Rev. John Carroll, First Archbishop of Baltimore, with select portions of his Writings*. Baltimore, 1843; B. U. CAMPBELL, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Most Rev. John Carroll*, in the *United States Catholic Magazine*, Vol. iii (1844), pp. 32–41, 98–101, 169–176, 244–248, 363–379, 662–669, 718–724, Vol. v (1846), pp. 595, 676, Vol. vi (1847), pp. 31, 100, 144, 434, 482, 592, Vol. vii (1848), pp. 91–106; SHEA, *Life and Times of the Most Reverend John Carroll*, being Vol. ii of his *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (1763–1815). New York, 1888; B. U. CAMPBELL, *Desultory Sketches of the Catholic Church in Maryland*, in the *Religious Cabinet* for 1842.

SECONDARY SOURCES: CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 32–113; REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 21; FINOTTI, *Bibliographia*, pp. 17-18, 22–29, 67–75, 192, 224, 225, 350, 376; RUSSELL, *Maryland the Land of Sanctuary*, pp. 367, 496–8, 509 (*Cf.* Appendix U. for Carroll genealogy). Baltimore, 1907; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 61–65; MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 20–69 *passim*, Vol. ii, pp. 70–168 *passim;* MCSWEENEY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 3–6, 16–19; 25–30, 48–56, 136, 151, 316, 522; WEBB, *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 161, 187, 201, 213–215. Much new material will be found in the CHR, Vols. i–iv (1915–1919), for which consult the General Indices. No special reference can be given to the ACHS *Researches*—see *Index* to the *Researches*, pp. 48–54. Philadelphia, 1916. *Cf.* GUILDAY, *English Catholic Refugees, etc.*, p. 144. London, 1914.

CHABRAT, Bishop Guy Ignatius (1787–1868); Coadjutor to Bishop Flaget of Bardstown (1834–1847); resigned 1847.

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 22; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 282–288; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 282; DE COURCY-SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 539; MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 262, Vol. ii, p. 15, 21; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 321–323; WEBB, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 93, 139, 191, 204, 210, 242, 270, 331, 348, 382. *Cf.* CHR, Vol. ii, p. 285, Vol. iii, p. 8. Bishop Chabrat was the first priest ordained in Kentucky, *cf.* CHR, Vol. i, p. 312, note 6.

CHANCHE, Bishop John J. (1795–1852); Bp. of Natchez (1840–1852).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 22; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 166–190; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 311; MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 5, 56, 107, 114–117, 180; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 21, 106, 122; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. iv, p. 146, Vol. xx, p. 48; CHR, Vol. i, p. 175 (his letters to the Leopoldine Association), Vol. ii, p. 132; SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Church, etc.*, Vol. iii, pp. 411, 432–436, 660–665, 706.

CHAPELLE, Archbishop Placide Louis (1842–1905); Coadjutor Bp. of Santa Fe (1891–1893); Arch. of Santa Fe (1894–1897); Arch. of New Orleans (1897–1898); Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Porto Rico (1898–1900); Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines (1901–1905).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 23; CUB, Vol. xii, p. 187; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. xxiv, p. 357; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 180, 432, Vol. iii, p. 31; Vol. iv, pp. 331, 362–363. Biographical sketch in CE, Vol. iii, p. 579.

CHATARD, Bishop Francis Silas (1834–1918); Rector American College, Rome (1868–1878); Bp. of Vincennes (1878–1898); transferred to Indianapolis (1898–1918).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–23; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 388; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 287; BRANN, *History of the American College of the Roman Catholic Church of the United States*, Rome, Italy, New York, 1910; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 47, 475, 485, 490, 520, Vol. ii, pp. 8, 180, 196, 205, 231, 329.

CHEVERUS, Cardinal John-Louis Lefebvre De (1768–1836). Bp. of Boston (1808–1823); Bp. of Montauban (1823–1826); Arch. of Bordeaux (1826–1836); Cardinal, 1835.

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 23; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 164–185; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 85–87; SHEA, *Hist. of the Cath. Missions among the Indian Tribes of the United States* (1529–1854), p. 157. New York, 1855; SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Church in the United States*, Vol. iii, pp. 107–181; HAMON, *Vie du Cardinal Cheverus*, Paris, 1837; English translation of Hamon by STEWART, Boston, 1839; DOUHOURG, J.HUEN, *Cardinal De Cheverus*, trans. by Robert M. Walsh. Philadelphia: Hooker and Claxton, 1839; LEAHY, *Archdiocese of Boston* in *History of the Catholic Church in the New England States*, Boston, 1889; CE, Vol. iii, p. 650; MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 9, 18, 32, 37–38, 54, 78, 83, 97–99, 103–108, 233—letters of, pp. 19, 30, 103, Vol. ii, pp. 81 (funeral of); MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 28, 49–50, 124, 156, 172; FINOTTI, *op. cit.*, pp. 40–41, 50, 119–120, 130, 143, 177, 191, 195, 239, 240–242; FISH, *op. cit.*, pp. 176–178; KENNEY, *Centenary, etc.*, p. 32 (portrait of Cheverus); ACHS *Records*, Vol. xii (1901), pp. 358–361 (*Two letters from Rt. Rev. John Cheverus to Jean Marie Maximilien de Vernous, Marquis de Bonneuil*); *ibid.*, Vol. xv (1904), pp. 35–45 (*Boston's first Catholic Church*, by E. I. DEVITT, S.J., contains also letters of Matignon to Carroll); *ibid.*, Vol. xiv (1903), pp. 229–282 (*An Interesting Correspondence*, by I. M. O'REILLY contains an excellent historical introduction to Cheverus' life); *ibid.*, Vol. xv (1904), pp. 83–112 (sixty-four letters from the Cheverus papers); *cf.* O'REILLY, *Cheverus in France*, a second series of letters in the ACHS *Records*, Vol. xvii (1906), pp. 97, 211, 348, 486. *Cf.* also *My Unknown Chum*. New York, 1917 (Devin Adair Co.); *U. S. Cath. Magazine*, Vol. iv (1845), p. 200 (portrait of Cheverus), pp. 261–267 (*Notice of Card. Cheverus*). See *Index* to ACHS *Researches*, p. 70. CHR, Vol. i, pp. 151, 279, 310–11, 369, Vol. ii, pp. 21–29, 40, 77, 228–230, 296, 300, Vol. iv, pp. 38, 42, 48, 403.

The Rev. Charles W. Collins of St. Clement's House, Boston, Mass., who has been making a special study of the history of the Boston Archdiocese, has sent us the following lists, all of which contain material for the Cheverus bibliography:

1. *History of Boston.*

Boston, Memorial History of, edited by Justin Winsor, 4 vols. Ticknor & Co., Boston, 1886. In Vol. iii, *The Roman Catholic Church* by V. Rev. Wm. Byrne, D.D.; *Boston, Old Landmarks and Historic Personages of*, by S. A. Drake. J. H. Osgood & Co., Boston, 1873; *Boston, King's Handbook of*, compiled by Moses King. Cambridge, 1878; 5,000 *Boston Events* compiled by E. H. Savage. Tolman & White, Boston, 1884.

2. *Poterie, Abbé de la (first resident Catholic priest in Boston).*

Catholics and the American Revolution, by M. I. J. Griffin, Vol. 3, page 290; *Les Combattants Français de la Guerre Americaine*, 1778–1783, Washington, Imprimerie Nationale, 1905, pp. 170, 246; *Boston, History of*, by C. H. Snow, p. 340; Massachusetts Historical Society *Collections*, series 1, Vol. iii, p. 264, Nov. 24, 1790, Jan. 26, June 24, July 30, 1791; *Boston Topographical and historical description of*, 1794, in the *U. S. Catholic Magazine*, Vol. 8, p. 103; Broadside of Abbé de la Poterie to public, Jan. 29, 1789; Broadside (1789?); *Boston Gazette*, 13 July, 1789; *Boston Pilot*, 1865—J. G. Shea, *Notes on Catholicity in N. E.*; *Baltimore Archives*, letters of La Poterie to Bishop Carroll; *Boston Archives:* Memoir for History of Diocese of Boston; Minutes of parish meetings of Holy Cross Church, 1789.

3. *Rousselet, Rev. Louis (second resident priest of Holy Cross Church, Boston).*

Massachusetts Historical Soc. *Colls.*, Belknap Papers, Vol. 3, p. 240; *Columbian Centinel*, Boston, files 1791 *seq*; *Baltimore Archives*, letters Rousselet to Bishop Carroll and Bishop Carroll to Rousselet; *Boston Archives*, Memoir for History of Diocese of Boston.

4. *Thayer, Rev. John (third priest of Holy Cross Church, Boston).*

Thayer family memorial, by Ezra Thayer; *Tableau des principales conversions*, by M. Nagot; *Salem, Annals of*, by J. B. Felt; *Kentucky, Sketches of*, by Spalding; Propagation of the Faith *Annals; Recollections of S. Breck.* Philadelphia, 1877; *Boston, History of*, by C. H. Snow; Mass. Hist. Soc. *Colls.*, sixth series, Belknap Papers, Vol. 3; *Columbian Centinel*, Boston (10 Sept., 1788), 1789, 1790, 1791; *Baltimore Archives*, correspondence with Bishop Carroll; *Boston Archives*, Memoir of History of Diocese of Boston; *Boston Pilot*, 1865.

5. *Matignon, Rev. F. A. (fourth priest of Holy Cross Church, Boston).*

Boston, Memorial History of, Winsor ed. Boston, 1886, Vol. 3; *Boston, Centennial volume of Diocese* (1803–1903), 1903; *Boston Commercial Gazette*, files 1818; *Columbian Centinel*, Boston, 1818; *Baltimore Archives*, correspondence with Bp. Carroll, 1792–1817; *Boston Archives*, account book Holy Cross Church, 1793–1803.

6. *Cheverus, John Cardinal.*

Nouvelle Biographie Universelle, Paris, F. Didot Frères, 1854, Vol. 9, p. 270 *seq.*; *Boston Monthly Magazine*, June, 1825; *Boston, Memorial History of*, edited by J. Winsor, Boston, Ticknor & Co., 1886, Vol. 3, p. 516 *seq.*; *Bostonian Society Publications*, Vol. 2, p. 32 *seq.*; *Metropolitan, The*, Vol. iv, pp. 460, 462; *Figures of the Past*, by Josiah Quincy, Boston, Roberts Bros., 1883, pp. 311, 313; *Recollections of Samuel Breck*, Philadelphia, Porter & Coates, 1877, p. 117; *Cheverus, Vie du Cardinal de*, par M. le Curé de S. Sulpice, Paris, J. Lecoffre & Cie, 1858; *New England, Sketches of Catholic Church in*, by Rev. J. Fitton, Boston, P. Donahue, 1872, pp. 99 *seq.*; *Boston Herald*, 2, Aug. 1903; *Boston Commercial Gazette*, 20 June, 1827; *Columbian Centinel*, Boston, 20 June, 1827; *Baltimore Archives:* letters Cheverus to Bishop Carroll, 1797–1816, to Arch. Neale, 1816–1817, to Arch. Marechal, 1817–1823; *Boston Archives:* Memoir for Ecclesiastical History of Boston; letter Fr. Cheverus in reply to article in *Telegraph*, 20 May, 1800, signed *A Catholick*, letter to —— Boston, 17 April, 1801, letter to editor *Boston Anthology*, 4 May, 1807, address of Boston Catholics to Bishop-elect Cheverus, 27 Sept. 1810, letter Bishop Cheverus to god-child, Boston, 2 April, 1816.

CLANCY, Bishop William (1802–1847); Coadjutor of Charleston (1834–37); Vicar Apostolic of British Guiana (1837–1893).

REUSS, *op.cit.*, pp. 23–24 (contains full notes on his erratic career); CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 44–57; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 200; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. vi, pp. 121–125, Vol. viii, p. 167, Vol. x, p. 144, Vol. xx, p. 186; CHR, Vol. i, p. 376.

COLTON, Bishop Charles Henry (1848–1915); Bp. of Buffalo (1903–1915).

CHR, Vol. ii, p. 142; CE, Vol. iii, p. 39; DONOHUE, *History of the Cath. Church in Western New York*. Buffalo, 1904. Files of *The Echo*, and of the *Catholic Union and Times* of Buffalo, for May, 1915. TIMON, *Missions in Western New York*. Buffalo, 1862; CRONIN, *Life and Times of Bishop Ryan*. Buffalo, 1893.

CONATY, Bishop Thomas (1847–1915); Rector of The Catholic University of America (1897–1903); titular Bishop of Samos (1901–1902); Bp. of Monterey and Los Angeles (1907–1915).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 25; CUB, Vol. iv, pp. 487, 493, Vol. viii, p. 124, Vol. ix, p. 439; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 294. *Cf.* files of *The Tidings*, for September, 1915.

CONCANEN, Bishop Richard Luke, O.P. (1740–1810); Bp. of New York (1808–1810).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 25–26; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 140–143; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 132–133; BENNETT, *op. cit.*, p. 459; HEWITT, *History of the Diocese of Syracuse*, pp. 21–23. Syracuse, 1909; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 151; WEBB, *op. cit.*, p. 202; FINOTTI, *op. cit.*, p. 177; FISH, *op. cit.*, p. 174, 175, 192; JOHN TALBOT SMITH, *The Catholic Church in New York*, Vol. i, p. 38–39. New York, 1905; *cf. Index* to ACHS *Researches*, pp. 75–77; the best account of his life is that by V. F. O'Daniel, O.P., in the CHR, Vol. i, pp. 400–421, Vol. ii, pp. 19–46. A complete bibliography will be found pp. 400–401 of the CHR, Vol. i (The *Dominican Archives* at Washington, D. C., contain photostatic copies of his correspondence). *Cf.* CHR, Vol. i, p. 311, Vol. ii, p. 140.

CONNOLLY, Bishop John, O.P. (1750–1825); Bp. of New York (1814–1825).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 26–27; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 192–204; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 133; J. T. SMITH, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 15–70; HEWITT, *op. cit.*, p. 24; FINOTTI, *op. cit.*, p. 239; MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 88, 125; USCHS *Historical Records and Studies*, Vol. ii (1900), p. 227 (his portrait); *U. S. Cath. Hist. Magazine*, Vol. iv (1891–93), pp. 58–61 and 186–198. (CONNOLLY correspondence), ACHS *Researches*, Vol. xxii, pp. 91, 232, 250, Vol. xxiv, p. 379, Vol. xxxiii, p. 343. See *Rosary Magazine*, for April, 1895. BAYLEY, *Brief Sketch of the History of the C. C. on the Island of New York*. New York, 1853. *Cf.* files of the *Catholic Miscellany*, for 1824-1825. Biographical sketch in CE, Vol. iv, p. 257.

CONROY, Bishop John Joseph (1819–1895); Bp. of Albany (1865–1877); tit. Bp. of Curium (1878–1895).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 27; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 179; CUB, Vol. vii, p. 128; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 407–411, 545; Vol. ii, p. 180; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. vii, p. 101; FARLEY, *Life of John Cardinal McCloskey*, pp. 223–224, 245, 261, 328; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 141.

CONWELL, Bishop Henry (1745–1842); Bp. of Philadelphia (1820–1842).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 27–28; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 310–327; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 156; FISH, *op. cit.*, pp. 146–147, 180–182; FINOTTI, *op. cit.*, pp. 139, 141, 143, 149, 151–170 *passim;* MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 112; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 60, 150, 164, 227, 241; KIRLIN, *Catholicity in Philadelphia*, pp. 219–266. Philadelphia, 1909. *Cf. Index* to ACHS *Researches*, pp. 78–79. The American Catholic Historical Society began in 1913 (Vol. xxiv, p. 16 of its *Records*) the publication of the *Life of Bishop Conwell* of Philadelphia, written by Martin I. J. Griffin. For the literature on the troubles which burdened Conwell's episcopate, *cf. Index of Historical Pamphlets in the Library of St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.*, in the ACHS *Records*, Vol. xiii (1902), pp. 66–119. *Cf.* CHR, Vol. i, p. 357, Vol. ii, pp. 227, 428, Vol. iii, pp. 22, 23, 336. *Cf.* for an account of his funeral by an eyewitness, SALZBACHER, *Meine Reise nach Nord-Amerika im Jahre* 1842. Vienna, 1895. SHEA, *Hist. C. C. in the U. S.*, Vol. iii, pp. 229–264.

CORRIGAN, Archbishop Michael Augustine (1839–1902); Bp. of Newark (1873–1880); Coadjutor Archbishop of New York (1880–1885); Arch. of New York (1885–1902).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 29; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 148; J. T. SMITH, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 404–430 (*cf. ibid.*, pp. 542–555 for an account, somewhat partisan, of the McGlynn case); *The Silver Jubilee of Arch. Corrigan* (with portrait), in the USCHS *Hist. Records and Studies*, Vol. i (1905), pp. 14–17. See Corrigan's *Register of the Clergy laboring in the Archdiocese of New York from early missionary times to* 1885, begun in the *Hist. Records and Studies*, Vol. i, p. 18; CUB, Vol. viii, p. 382; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. ix, p. 95, Vol. xi, p. 143, Vol. xxii, p. 149, Vol. xxvi, p. 45; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 416, 501, 517, 525, Vol. ii, pp. 1–3, 180–185, 196, 213, 222, 279, 299, 350. See biog. sketch in *Hist. Records and Studies*, Vol. iii (1903), pp. 9–13; FARLEY, *op. cit.*, pp. 211, 349–350, 362–363, 369, 376–377; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 140, 143, 193, 194, 204, 302; *Memorial of Most Rev. Archbishop Corrigan, Third Archbishop of New York.* New York, 1902; FLYNN, *Cath. Church in New Jersey.* Morristown, 1904; FARLEY, *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral.* New York, 1908.

COSGROVE, Bishop Henry (1834–1906); Bp. of Davenport (1884–1906).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 29; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 219; GIGLINGER, *The Rt. Rev. Henry Cosgrove*, biog. sketch, in *Acta et Dicta*, Vol. ii, July, 1910, pp. 211–218—portrait on page 210; *cf. The Messenger* (New York), for January, 1907; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. xxii, p. 175; MCGOVERN, *Life and Writings of Rt. Rev. John Wm. McMullen, D.D., first bishop of Davenport, Iowa.* Milwaukee, 1888. *Cf.* CHR, Vol. iii, p. 162; KEMPKER, *History of the Catholic Church in Iowa* (1884).

COTTER, Bishop Joseph Bernard (1844–1908); Bp. of Winona (1889–1909).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 29; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 158.

CRÉTIN, Bishop Joseph (1799–1857); Bishop of St. Paul (1850–1857).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 30; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 415–430; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 377; DE COURCY-SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 639; SHEA, *History of the Catholic Missions, etc.*, p. 400; CHR, Vol. i, p. 63 (letters), Vol. ii, 428, Vol. iii, p. 555–556; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. viii, p. 261, Vol. xii, pp. 82–84, Vol. xv, p. 46. Biog. sketch in CE, Vol. iv, pp. 487–488. Most of the material for Bishop Crétin's life is still in manuscript, but special reference should be